REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 000 24 AA 000 268

SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION CONSORTIUM. PUBLICATION 109, RETRIEVING SOCIAL SCIENCE KNOWLEDGE FOR SECONDARY CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT.

BY- JUNG, CHARLES AND OTHERS
PURDUE UNIV., LAFAYETTE, IND.
REPORT NUMBER SSEC-PUB-109 PUB DATE MAR 66
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0619-PUB-109
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.00 98P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SOCIAL SCIENCES, *CURRICULUM PLANNING, *HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM, *METHODOLOGY, *UNITS OF STUDY (SUBJECSOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION CONSOR

A SERIES OF SIXTEEN 2 1/2-HOUR INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED WITH SMALL GROUPS OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS TO OBTAIN THEIR ANSWERS TO THE QUESTION, "WHAT PHENOMENA, CONCEPTS, THEORIES, ISSUES AND METHODOLOGIES FROM YOUR AREA SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN A HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL SCIENCE CURRICULUM." SOME OF THESE INTERVIEW SESSIONS WERE WITH GROUPS OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS FOCUSING ON BASIC DISCIPLINARY AREAS. OTHERS WERE WITH GROUPS CONCERNED WITH THE MORE APPLIED AREAS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE. IN A 17TH SESSION, THE TEAM MEMBERS DISCUSSED STRATEGIES FOR USE OF THE DATA. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA POINTED TO FIVE UNITS HAVING CONCEPT FOCI BASIC TO ALL AND ANOTHER SERIES OF FIVE UNITS WHICH DID NOT NECESSARILY DEPEND UPON EACH OTHER. THE UNITS COULD BE DEVELOPED EITHER AS NEW COURSES OR AS UNITS TO BE USED, WHEN SEEN AS APPROPRIATE, IN ALREADY EXISTING COURSES. THIS PAPER WAS WRITTEN AS PART OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION CONSORTIUM, A CURRICULUM PROJECT DESIGNED TO OUTLINE THE CONCEPTS, METHODS, AND STRUCTURE OF SEVERAL OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES FOR USE BY TEACHERS AND CURRICULUM WORKERS AT ALL GRADE LEVELS. (TC)

BR 5-0619
PA 24

ED014000

RETRIEVING SOCIAL SCIENCE KNOWLEDGE FOR SECONDARY CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Charles Jung
Ronald Lippitt
Robert Fox
University of Michigan

SOCIAL
SCIENCE
EDUCATION
CONSORTIUM

SS
EC

AA000268

RETRIEVING SOCIAL SCIENCE KNOWLEDGE FOR SECONDARY CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Charles Jung
Ronald Lippitt
Robert Fox
University of Michigan

Publication #109 of the
Social Science Education Consortium

Irving Morrissett, Executive Director
Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program.

RETRIEVING SOCIAL SCIENCE KNOWLEDGE FOR SECONDARY CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Charles Jung, Ronald Lippitt, and Robert Fox
Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan

FOREWORD

This paper by Professors Charles Jung, Ronald Lippitt and Robert Fox was written as part of a curriculum project supported in part by a developmental contract of the United States Office of Education, made with Purdue University for the Social Science Education Consortium. The project is directed by Professor Lippitt, Program Director of the Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, and Professor of Psychology and Sociology, University of Michigan.

The interview sessions reported here provide a rich mine of information about the social sciences, the use of which is only suggested in a preliminary way in the author's preface. Professor Lippitt and his group plan to continue their analysis and organization of the materials in the interviews, with the aims, first, of providing a detailed structure of concepts, phenomena and methodologies upon which various social science curricula for secondary schools can be built; and, second, of developing a number of experimental cross-disciplinary curriculum units.

Readers may be interested in contrasting the cross-disciplinary approach of Professor Lippitt's group with the "orchestrated" approach to social science curriculum content and structure taken by the group working with Professor Senesh of Purdue University. In the former, features which the social sciences have in common are stressed; in the latter, the identity of the individual disciplines is clearly maintained. The work of Professor Senesh's group is reported in SSEC Publications 101 through 106; an overall view of this work is given in a chapter by Professor Senesh in Publication 121.

Irving Morrissett

March 1966

PREFACE

The Problem

Societal changes are occurring in the world today at an unprecedented rate. At the same time, the comparatively new disciplines of social science such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, and economics are developing rapidly. Social science knowledge is accumulating faster than it is being made available to social practitioners or to the general citizenry who have need of it for application to the critical social issues of our times. Applied research is already indicating some of the benefits to be derived from such applications. However, it appears that general lack of awareness of what is available from the social sciences is contributing to a growing lag between what is known and efforts to make applications.

One major implication of this situation is that the general citizenry needs to be given a more adequate opportunity to become aware of what the social sciences are and of their potential applications. There is, at this time, very little opportunity in the curriculum of our elementary and secondary schools for children to become aware of the knowledge available from the behavioral sciences or to explore its application to personal and community problems. Such opportunities are encountered by some, not all, at the college level. Less advantaged youth, who do not teach the college level, have no chance to become informed in this area which is of the greatest relevance for them. The project reported here has sought to develop substantive content for social science curricula at the secondary school level.

The Approach

Several alternative approaches are possible in selecting content for secondary social science curricula. One approach is disciplinary; a second seeks common phenomena, concepts, and methodologies which cut across the social science disciplines; still another categorizes the knowledge currently available in curricular materials and in scientific reports and selects from them content for instruction. A fourth approach is to secure from leading social scientists nominations of the knowledge which they see as most relevant for inclusion in the curriculum. Our group has chosen a combination of the second and fourth methods: securing from social scientists recommendations regarding the most relevant knowledge from their disciplines for the education of young people, and screening those recommendations for concepts, phenomena and methodologies which cut across the majority of the social science disciplines.

The Procedure

We chose to undertake the task of retrieving knowledge to use in developing secondary social science curricula by means of a cross-representational team. This team initially included Ronald Lippitt, a sociologist-psychologist, Mark Chesler, a social psychologist, Charles Jung, an educational psychologist, Milan Marich, a school of education professor of social studies methods, and William Nimroth, a school system social studies curriculum director.

This team conducted a series of sixteen two-and-a-half-hour interviews with small groups of social scientists during the school year 1964-65, to obtain their answers to the question, "What phenomena, concepts, theories, issues and methodologies from your area should be included in a high school social science curriculum?" The social scientists were also asked what they believed were the most important frontiers of knowledge in their areas of specialization. Some of these interview sessions were with groups of social scientists focusing on basic disciplinary areas; others were with groups concerned with the more applied areas of social science. In a seventeenth session, the team members discussed strategies for use of the data. The subjects of the sessions, and the participants in each session, have been listed in the Table of Contents.

A tape recording was made of each session. One member of the team also kept general notes on large newsprint sheets which all could follow, and correct, as each session progressed. The recorder later used these notes as he listened to the tape and wrote up a comprehensive report of the information supplied at the session. Two copies of the report were sent to each person who had attended. Each then returned one copy with corrections or additions, which were incorporated in a final report.

During the summer of 1965, the information in these seventeen reports was broken down into the smallest possible meaningful statements, such as, "procedures and norms affect group decision making" and "the greatest generators of conflicts in organizations are social power, authority and status." These statements were categorized under the major headings of objectives, content, values, and teaching methodologies. They were further categorized under sub-headings which seemed to emerge out of the data, such as "freedom and conformity", "power", "dissonance", and "decision making".

Major attention during the fall of 1966 was directed to the data under the "content" heading. This resulted in identification of ten potential curriculum units which could be developed, incorporating the knowledge suggested in these sessions. Robert Fox, a professor of education and past president of the Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, joined the team during this period.

Organization and Integration of the Data

Analysis of the material concerning "objectives" and "teaching methodologies" yielded the following notes regarding objectives and ideas for implementing them.

Goals and Objectives:

- A. General considerations
    1. Depend on grade level and sub-content area
    2. Include certain attitudes, skills and understandings
- B. Major goals
    1. Scientific methods in problem solving
    2. Cause and effect interaction
    3. Holism as a principle in understanding the world
    4. Values, social membership, and participation commitments
    5. Personal growth in self-control and direction

Ideas of Implementation of Objectives:

- A. Analytic skill in doing social science
- B. Experience in being a social scientist
- C. Focus on phenomena
- D. Apply social science to self and immediate environment
- E. Basic experiential dilemmas
- F. Learning to inquire
    1. Confrontation episode
    2. What's going on?
    3. Why does it happen?
    4. What happens next?
    5. Where do I fit?
    6. Do I make a difference?
    7. How do I express myself on this?

Criteria for organizing the "content" data into units were decided upon as follows. The data must:

1. Fit a topic which focuses on dynamic processes.
2. Utilize phenomena.
3. Promote inquiry.
4. Cut across many systems and disciplines.
5. Have salience for the learner.
6. Have salience for society.
7. Be significant from the standpoint of the scientist.

Analysis of the "content" data pointed to two kinds of units. Five tentative units of the first kind are seen as having concept foci which are basic to all of a second set of five units which do not necessarily depend on each other. The unit headings and some concepts which might be included are listed below:

Concept Units Basic to All the Suggested Units

1. Change - including concepts such as the Lewinian "force field" model of dynamic equilibria of forces; learning; normative, planned and developmental change.

2. Value - including concepts such as choice and the influencing feelings such as trust-distrust.

3. Multiple Causation - including concepts such as those found in a model of behavior called the "circular process of interpersonal relation".

4. Life Space - including concepts such as time; space; Lewinian "life space" with its internal and external components of the perceived environment; psychological impact of physical and physiological variables.

5. Rationality-Emotionality - including concepts of affect and cognition and their interaction in behavior.

Other Content Units

1. Deviation and Conformity - including concepts such as pluralism and normativeness.

2. Identity and Membership - including concepts such as individual identity; status roles; institutional identity; multiple loyalty; interrelations; the individual in the group; the individual and the group.

3. Conflict and Conflict Resolution - including concepts such as goal; approach-avoidance; win-lose; compromise.

4. Decision Making and Action Taking - including concepts such as problem solving; resource identification; development and utilization; communication and feedback.

5. Power and Influence - including concepts such as dependence; independence; couter-dependence; and inter-dependence.

A next step in use of the data is the organization under each of these unit headings of clusters of concepts and clusters of phenomena, objects and setting referred to.

Potential Applications

There are several alternatives which may be considered for applying the data as they have been organized to the task of creating secondary school social science curricula. The units could be developed as new courses, or they could be developed as units to be used when seen as appropriate in already existing courses. The units could be organized around interaction phenomena, or as they apply in settings such as the family, the school, the community, or internationally. The units could be developed with disciplines, on a cross-disciplineary comparative basis, or on an interdisciplinary basis. Such possibilities need to be considered along with careful exploration of possible teacher-learning approaches in taking a next step toward development of a curriculum.

Table of Contents and List of Consultants*

Session	Consultants	Topic	Page
1	Dorwin Cartwright Professor of Psychology	Social Psychology	1
	Theodore Newcomb Professor of Sociology and Psychology		
2	Elizabeth Douvan Associate Professor of Psychology	Personality Development	8
	Joseph Veroff Associate Professor of Psychology		
	Jesse Gordon Associate Professor of Social Work		
3	Robert MacLeod Professor of Psychology Cornell University	General Psychology	13
	Daniel Miller Professor of Social Psychology		
	William McKeachie Professor of Psychology		
4	Allen Menlo Associate Professor of Education	Social Science Application	21
	Jack Rothman Professor of Social Work		
	Edwin J. Thomas Professor of Social Work		
5	Gene Burnstein Associate Professor of Psychology	Cognition	25
	Robert Zajonc Professor of Psychology and Study Director, Research Center for Group Dynamics		
6	Arthur Melton Professor of Psychology	Learning	29
7	Robert Kahn Professor of Psychology Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Small Groups	33

---

*All consultants are from the University of Michigan, unless otherwise noted.

	Stanford Seashore Assistant Director Institute for Social Research		
8	Richard Hoffman Professor of Psychology University of Chicago Norman Maier Professor of Psychology Richard Mann Associate Professor of Psychology	Organization	39
9	Phil Converse Program Director Survey Research Center M. Kent Jennings Assistant Professor of Political Science	Political Science	43
10	Theral T. Herrick Professor of Economic Education Executive Director, Council on Economic Education James Morgan Professor of Economics and Program Director, Institute for Social Research	Economics I	51
11	Daniel Fusfeld Professor of Economics Kenneth Boulding Professor of Economics	Economics II	57
12	Stanford Erikson Director, Center for Research on Teaching and Learning Frank Koen Professor of Psychology	Teaching and Learning	62
13	Robert Angell Professor of Sociology Stephen Withey Professor of Psychology	The School: A Social Setting	66
14	Robert Blood Professor of Sociology	The Family	74

	Dorothy Marquis Department of Psychology and Education		
15	Marvin E. Olsen Assistant Professor of Psychology Indiana University	Sociology	77
	Leon Mayhew Assistant Professor of Sociology		
16	Richard Cutler Professor of Psychology	Developmental Psychology	81
17	Core Group:	Summation	83
	Ronald Lippitt, Chairman Professor of Sociology and Psychology Program Director, Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge		
	Mark Chesler Assistant Project Director, Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge		
	Robert Fox Director, University Elementary School and Research Associate, Institute for Social Research (On sabbatical for some of sessions in India)		
	Charles Jung Assistant Project Director, Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge		
	Milan Marich Instructor, School of Education Teacher, University School		
	William Nimroth Administrative Officer Ann Arbor Public Schools		

SESSION 1

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

This is the first meeting of the core and resource team investigating Secondary Social Science Education. The consultants this meeting are Professors Theodore Newcomb and Dorwin Cartright. The general problem we have presented for discussion is: "What methodologies, topics, generalizations, concepts, or phenomena would you include in a limited number of units on social psychology in a high school social science curriculum?" It was suggested that another way of asking this question was: "What would you, as a college professor, want your people to know if they were coming from a high school course in social science?" What are the greatest preparation deficiencies for college people in the social science? There was objection to this form of question since some high school students might be terminal and not college preparatory. Cartright suggested that this course be seen neither as preparatory nor substituted for college studies, but an independent attempt to expose students to the range of disciplines and the phenomena studied by the social psychologist. A sole emphasis on preparing students for college courses is most dangerous in that we also want to communicate information, modes, and orientations about the social sciences to students who may have no intention or no possibility of going on to college. There was some division within the group at this point. Some felt strongly that the high school course ought to be seen as orientative and preparatory to college courses and majors, while others felt strongly that it ought to be a unit in itself. The latter group felt that the study of science and social science may play an important part in the daily lives of people who are not going to college.

The consultants felt an important starting place for this topic was a discussion of the objectives of such a course. Newcomb stated two important objectives: (1) that students understand quantification as it applies to human affairs and (2) that students study issues close to their lives which are seldom dealt with objectively. Mr. Lippitt raised a question about possible conflicts between this objective, analytic role and the young person's participative role and involvement in his own affairs. We discussed whether being an analytic observer was possible for a participant and decided there was no inherent conflict.

Cartright broadly described these objectives as matters of a scientific orientation to the social world and the development of scientific methodology and thinking. Newcomb added the objective that young people understand cause and effect relations and see phenomena as being caused by other phenomena. We proceeded to notions of multiple and plural causation, and the interaction affects among a variety of single causes. This was felt to be a crucial area of learning. In this context, Newcomb stressed some digression should happen in the classroom and that there should be no attempt to stick rigorously to one definition of independence or dependence. What is an independent variable in one case may be a dependent variable in another case. Attitudes, for instance, may be both determinants and consequences of prejudice. Newcomb also felt that this would motivate high school students because it was fun and exciting to delve into the conditions and causes of phenomena.

As an example of multiple causation and interaction affects, Newcomb suggested the investigation of how heredity and environment interact to produce skills, abilities and personalities. He noted that some scientific methodology and causative analysis is taught in biology and chemistry, but that for the most part these skills and modes are not seen as transferable to social and human phenomena. Therefore, a major objective of secondary social science courses would be to show how some methodologies of biology and chemistry can be generalized and used to look at social phenomena.

Another issue discussed in this connection was the level of teacher preparation and teacher ability needed to: (1) teach social science and causation and (2) teach it so that it is seen as generalizable to a number of phenomena and a number of disciplines. Important data to collect in this regard might be the character of teaching history and social studies courses in the high schools now. Is it the case, as we suspect, that many phenomena are presently taught as having single causes, or as being the results of non-social events. Some need to be retaught as the outcomes of a variety of social events. Is history taught from the point of view of the great man, or singly caused position, or is it taught as multi-caused? The current mode of teaching about causation is crucial to know because it provides us with the jumping off point for students and for teacher learning about multiple causation in the social sciences.

With these objectives in mind, we prepared to discuss the question of where to start in a high school social science course. Newcomb felt that an important place to start was not with the discipline as presently organized, but with phenomena in which students are currently investigating or with topics that are close to their daily lives. He expressed the idea that he could draw out of these kinds of experiences and learnings the more abstract conceptions of cognition, perception, motivation, etc.. As an example of a topic with which to start he suggested the phenomena of prejudice. He did not suggest prejudice as a social organizational problem, but prejudice as a set of feelings and attitudes that students live with and want to understand. In prejudice there might be good materials for teaching about perceptions, social learnings, and perhaps the learnings of hate.

Cartright raised a question about the feasibility of starting with prejudice. This particular topic or set of phenomena might be too threatening to students for them to treat either with openness or objectivity. Newcomb responded that the notion of threat was more related to teaching techniques than to the problem, although it was quite possible that it might be useful to start with problems or topics that were less intimate and threatening. Some other examples of topics that might be tried to be used at this level are social prestige, social popularity, isolation. Other examples are how do people grow up, or what makes people so different or ~~so~~ similiar to one another? Some of the topics or the issues that might be looked at in either of these areas are heredity, environment, age, sex, race, religion, social class, and personality. In general both consultants were talking about teaching principles of psychology and social psychology in context of, and out of experience with, certain kinds of phenomena.

Lippitt raised the question of whether we were talking about issues in terms of our own professional training and level of abstraction, or the way they presented themselves to young people. Cartright again focused on the problem of threat and raised the question of whether there might be ways of teaching problems of social prestige that talked in general of cliques, clubs, feelings about others. He felt there was too much threat involved at the level of investigating my personal popularity and my own personal feelings about isolation.

We next attempted to deal with the priorities for attention in secondary social science. Cartright felt an important problem for study was the preconceptinns high school students made about the nature of society. These preconceptions often block them from doing certain kinds of learning and studying. Newcomb suggested a focus on attempting to investigate and explain things that the student took for granted; things that the student felt were inexplicable or given by nature. Attention to these kinds of phenomena would provide the most important kinds of learning and growth for social science. Newcomb felt that it is explaining the inexplicable that social science is most valuable. Some examples of the ineffable topics may be instincts, or liking and loving, or the "way people are".

Cartright wanted to be more specific in establishing his priorities for approaching some of these same phenomena. Taking for example, the topic of prejudice, he felt the first step would be to define prejudice; the second step might be to look at some of the preconditions or causes of it. Examples of such causes might be learning, parental and social influence and group membership. A third step would focus on the consequences of prejudice, or the effects of prejudice upon both the givers and the receivers. In dealing with this topic, Cartright felt that teaching the social scientific methodology should be given high priority. In teaching this "way of thinking", the place to start would be with problems of measurement. Tactics of question asking, interview construction, and sampling are important in deciding how you measure the phenomena of prejudice. The second step would be for students to do their own research, to go out and make systematic, controlled observations in the world about the phenomena. The third step involves various experimental methods and manipulations of variables or sub groups. Cartright stressed the need for students to go out into the world and collect data on others. If students collect the data on themselves and talk about their own feelings, they are more likely to raise problems of defensiveness. Further than this, Cartright felt it was difficult to talk about specific content of methodology because of a lack of knowledge about the students' grade, class, background, etc.. In fact, it may be necessary to build several variety of curricula so that teachers may plug in the appropriate one to her own classroom situation and her own resources.

We decided next to focus on some of the substantive areas of social scientific learning. We reflected that prejudice had been constantly referred to as an example of a good topic for several reasons. First of all, it is salient and therefore a good strategy for getting into the minds and involving young people. Secondly, it has great fruitfulness for generalizing about other concepts because it touches on many basic problems and thereby can be extended into many other areas of importance. Thirdly, there is a considerable body of social psychological literature and knowledge here which can contribute to young people's understanding of phenomena. Finally its very study may in some measure make people more aware of their own concerns and feelings and more cosmopolitan about the world they live in. Cartright suggested that we might take prejudice and teach within this context some of the major theories about prejudice and interpersonal behavior. For instance, we might spend time on theories including psychoanalytic, social learning, limitation, identification, identity notions, and issues of self-esteem.

Newcomb stated that he might teach balance theory as a general framework for looking at a limited set of problems. Some of the problems that might come up under balance theory are self and self other comparisons, groups that the self belongs to, functions of groups as reference elements, and problems of preception and judgement of other people. As another example, we took the problem of people and groups different from ourselves. Newcomb felt that first there were some person constants such as heredity, attitudes, personality, and values that make people different. Secondly, there are some membership group references and norms, both actual and perceived, that make people different. Thirdly, there are some roles and role determinants in terms of sex, age grading, and status that make people different. Any of these person, membership, or role dimensions could be taken either as independent or as dependent variables, either as conditions and causes, or as consequences. We all agreed that another major unit might be change. In this unit we would talk about biological development and maturation, cognitive development, learning, even to group and social change in attitudes, practices, and structure. Change itself is a phenomena that in many ways is inevitable and in many ways has considerable relevance to high school social science. This is a particular kind of topic that we have left out of our list so far.

We had an extensive discussion about the nature of certain kinds of models and their utility in the classroom. Chesler said that some social scientific models such as force field and life space seem to have great utility as graphic strategies of organizing materials and presenting it to students. At the same time, Cartright expressed major reservations regarding the mislearning of certain kinds of models. He felt, for instance, that the force field was not really presentable to high school students or even to undergraduates; in fact, it really cannot be understood except at the graduate level where students have had enough experience in making abstractions and theoretical developments to be able to follow it through. Cartright felt it would be dysfunctional and probably misinformation to teach these kinds of abstractions and technical models to high school students. The probable outcome is that students understand a little bit about it, just enough to talk about terms and to misapply them to phenomena and people. Cartright felt that there were many other concepts, such as group cohesiveness, which were diffuse enough technically and intuitive enough so they could be taught and understood profitably by high school students. Jung summarized the problem as one of the feasibility of communicating the meaning of terms effectively to young people, and the ability of students to understand and make use of them. Newcomb added his observation that the guild of psychologists and social psychologists often make terms more technical than they need be. Thereby they preserve the technicality and complexity of these terms and suggest that others cannot really understand them. Neither consultant felt that such was the case in this instance, but that this caution might apply in the future.

We concluded the meeting with some general process comments. We felt there needed to be ways of shortening Lippitt's introductinn in order to get started more quickly. One-and-a-half hours is really not enough, and we ought to be public about our attempt to finish at 2:30 instead of 2:00. Do we start at 12:00 or 12:30? We also raised some questions about the problem statement in asking our consultants to focus in on the high school course. Did that force them to pay too much attention to course mechanics and course problems rather than upon the summarizing and crucial elements of their discipline? In fact, it took quite a while to get to the core of the social psychological discipline with these two respondents. That may be partly due to the opening statement but also very importantly due to our own general orientation today and the broad competencies of these consultants. We did get some very valuable aid on the nature and objectives of a course. We agreed, however, to deliberately stay away from the objectives of the course as much as possible with other consultants. Our probes should get them to focus in on the content and substance of their areas. Perhaps we can come back at some extra meeting to a further discussion of objectives of the course. Marich raised the question of his own participation, at least in terms of whether it was wise to talk about what things were being done in the classroom, or things he was doing in the classroom. We pretty much agreed that for these sessions it would be most appropriate for us to probe our consultants rather than to be forceful about our own ideas except as clarifying probes. We have set aside time for the five of us to meet as the core team and at that time we can look at problems and strategies of teaching.

As final comments, Newcomb summarized some of our process notions by saying that it was a big job and tough to really focus us in on it in such a short time. Cartright almost felt that he wanted a second crack at this, since he barely got to listing what he felt were important topics, and spent a lot of time on the objectives of the course. Chesler felt it was vital that notes be taken on the board during the meeting. This would give continuity and focus for the meeting as well as making it easier to transcribe the tape. However, there is also a need to mark the tape occasionally so that particularly good portions or skippable sections can be noted.

A few references were suggested. They are:

1. McGrath
2. Newcomb
   (particularly Chapter by Converse on Attitudes)
3. Hyman and Shealsley
4. Allport and Krawer

SESSION 2

PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

For this session the social science consultants were Professors Gordon, Douvan, and Veroff.

It was suggested that one approach to studying personality could be that of looking at it from a scientific standpoint. The issue of methodology would be of initial importance here. This could be seen as a means of defining what is meant by personality. It could also be seen as a means of studying the phenomena which is called personality. It was suggested that demonstration experiences could be used. An example was given in which a class of children would be asked what people do when a new rule is given. If the response could be plotted, it would probably be seen as a J-curve. This is one way of demonstrating what people do under various stimulus conditions. This would introduce to the children an awareness that there are possible methodologies for studying people's behavior.

If one took the approach of individual differences to explain and study personality, then a number of different testing procedures could be explored. It was suggested that a question of basic importance in this approach would be that of whether one can, in fact, study empirically such individual differences as values. The importance here would be in developing an awareness that things which may seem intangible, such as values, can be studied scientifically.

Another initial approach that was suggested was that of the whole question of identity. This could be studied from the standpoint of such things as sex differences and interest, occupational career choices, and also social class differences, and the contributions of intelligence to occupational choice, to occupational success, and to performance. This could be looked at, in addition, from the standpoint of developmental differences.

It was felt that questions of methodology could be looked at taking this developmental identify and role focus. The meaningfulness of measurement could be explored around these dimensions of identity. The reliability of measurement and the question of what a meaningful correlation is were seen as important focuses of study. It was suggested that an experience which could bring out some of these phenomena in the classroom would be that of having several people describe the same person. The differences in these descriptions would be the demonstration.

It was noted that in science there is often an approach taken which begins by focusing on some exotic, unusual, or unexpected phenomena. It was felt that such an initial approach can be misleading. It was felt that it would be important to avoid such a misleading approach.

It was suggested that the developmental task orientation should be excitingly involving for children without possibly being misleading. The approaches of Havighurst and Erikson were suggested as examples of the kind of approaches that could be taken to identity. Such an approach was seen as somewhat different from the approach of the applied scientists who are seeking principles of behavior. The task orientation approach was considered to be one which looked at observable influences and observable outcomes. The other approach was seen as involving questions of what are the internal intervening variables between the observable influences and outcomes. It was felt that looking at the internal intervening variables might not be a good focus. It was suggested that this may be too difficult for youth to handle and may be misleading.

It was emphasized that it would be important to teach both the methodology of studying these phenomena as well as what some of the phenomena were and what had been learned about them.

It was suggested that the presentation of the material under discussion should not focus on individuals and should not promote the individual studying of phenomena by studying themselves. It was felt that study of the influences on behavior and the roles and tasks that one might be dealing with now, and might be moving toward dealing with in the near future, could be helpful in making explicit the kinds of variables that would go into individuals making choices. It was noted that in some past experiences in working with young children, they did apply the things they were learning to themselves and this did seem to have some positive influence on their behavior and on the choices they made. It was suggested that promoting deliberation in making choices was appropriate. The point was that deliberation should be encouraged so long as one was not forced to make self application.

The next part of the discussion was focused on purposes of introducing study of personality into the high school curriculum. It was suggested that it could be appropriately introduced as part of the humanities. In this sense it would be considered a field of knowledge about the world which has reached a certain level of development. If you are going to exist in the world, you need to know what the world contains and this is one aspect of it. In this case one focused on the field of personality as a field. One might look at its history, at the content with which it deals, and at some of its substantive products. This orientation was phrased as "a course for people watchers as compared to a course for star watchers".

A second kind of purpose that was suggested was that of studying personality as a preparation so that one could make use of this knowledge in some way. It was suggested that in order to be able to make use of the field, one needs some knowledge of the content of the field, with its major principles and something about the extent to which knowledge from the field might actually be utilizable and applicable to problems of living. Utility in this field might arise from the knowledge of it or skills related to the knowledge of it on the one hand, or in relation to the methodology that has been developed in the field on the other hand. From the standpoint of methodology, the utilization might be seen in terms of how do you go about finding answers to questions, how do you ask questions, or go about solving problems which relate to human behavior.

There was quite a bit of discussion concerning whether an approach to studying personality should be based on one or the other of these two purposes. One suggestion was that studying the methodology had a value in the utility to understanding the field in and of itself. Another suggestion was that one might study phenomena in the field of personality and that this would give rise to questions about methodology that had led one to identifying variables that were significant which related to this phenomena or were part of the phenomena. It was felt in using either approach, that both purposes were important and that both approaches sooner or later really go together or come together. This brought the discussion back to the idea of starting out such a course by looking at problems of identity. As one got into questions of how to explain things that have been found in this area of identity, one then goes into looking at the methodology.

It was suggested that some theoretical kinds of ideas such as those of Lewin might be good to use at this point. This might include such things as life space and force field. It was also felt that some of the learning theories might be appropriately introduced. Caution about not getting into some of the intervening variable kinds of theory was again raised. It was suggested that an example of a theoretical concept that might be inappropriate would be that of the unconscious.

There was a discussion about the appropriateness of studying the defenses. There were major concerns relative to mis-learning, un-learning, and inappropriate application to one's self. It might be appropriate to teach about defensive behavior as a response to certain kinds of situations rather than as part of the phenomena of inter-psychic conflict. It was further suggested that there may be very important age differences in relation to teaching of different kinds of concepts and phenomena. Defenses might be most usefully taught at early elementary level rather than at the level of adolsecence where there is an onslaught of impulses which increase conflict. The Miller approach-avoidance model of multiple loyalty was suggested. Some concern was expressed regarding the adequacy of training of teachers to deal with such material in presenting it to their children.

It was suggested that the concept of ego ideal might be a good one to deal with. One approach might include the idea of empathy in terms of feeling, through yourself, the feelings of others. It was cautioned that this should be handled in such a way as not be personalized by the children. There was concern expressed that teachers' training might not be adequate in order for them to avoid personalizing the material in working with the children on it. It was also suggested that this empathy concept was middle class and therefore might be inappropriate for some groupings of children. The idea of studying character rather than dynamics was suggested. Character could be approached in terms of the descriptive life time trends that one develops rather than internal dynamics of the moment. Individual differences such as social class, culture variables, and economic background might be looked at as they relate to and influence character, role identity, etc.. It was thought that it might be most appropriate to study character and the ideas of identity at the senior high level. It was suggested that looking at sex differences would be too hot an issue around the ages of eleven and twelve. At eleven and twelve one might look at friendship and ego ideal in terms of such things as hero worship. It was recommended that the word "personality" not be used in teaching this material because of the inappropriate definitions given to it.

It was suggested, in studying sex differences, the term "differences between boys and girls" be used rather than the word "sex". It was also cautioned that normative sex descriptions be handled carefully so that the children not interpret them as prescriptions for behavior. The importance of emphasizing the legitimacy of variance was noted. It was suggested that such materials be presented in a context of other variables. It was noted that deviance from norms is sometimes "good". Alternatives in behaving and making decisions should be high-lighted.

A number of references relative to the materials discussed were suggested. They included: Anastasi's book Individual Differences, the old rather than the new edition. Bell's NIH Infant Studies. At the senior high level it was suggested that studies of deliquency such as those of the Flint Youth Study, Havighurst and Bowman's recent book Growing Up In River City, Colman's work on the Adolescence Society, and Gold's study on Social Status in Deliquency. It was suggested that some of Sanason's work might be useful although it tended to deal heavily with anxiety. McLelland's work on sex differences relative to environment and achievement was suggested. Child development studies such as those which dealt with the relationship of parent practices to child behavior were suggested. Marty Hofman's work and Miller's and Swanson's book were suggested here. Shatter's studies of the influences of birth order was suggested and the review of some such material by Johnny Clauson was suggested. Macebbig's studies on child development were also suggested. Adelson and Duvan's work was also suggested. The national studies of youth behavior conducted by Withey were suggested. It was noted that the Canadian film board has put out a series of films, a few of which it was felt might be appropriate.

SESSION 3

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY

Our topic is general psychology and our resource people are Professors MacLeod, McKeachie, and Miller.

MacLeod stated that he was, in general, opposed to teaching psychology as a separate discipline in the high schools. He saw other disciplines being enriched by the teacher's preparation and sophistication in psychology. Therefore, he favored much more training for teachers in psychological subjects and material, but opposed a separate discipline of psychology in the schools. Lippitt noted that what we were really after was not a separate psychology course but a multi-disciplinary course in the social sciences. MacLeod understood this but still felt that high school students were severely limited in the amount of time they had, and therefore, priorities for training were in areas other than psychology or even integrated social science. For instance, he felt we ought to give deeper and better training in the languages and literature, mathematics, and the physical and biological sciences. Social studies and social sciences had lower priority than any of these afore mentioned.

He continued saying that the student naturally responds more easily and effectively to phenomena and things outside of himself, things that are foreign to himself and objectively observable. These are also the things that the student can most effectively and easily practice the scientific methodology. Therefore, MacLeod was in favor of beginning with this kind of material from the physical and biological sciences. In this same context, he felt that we ought to start by looking at the most obvious and clearest-cut phenomena. Tasks requiring the least amount of discrimination ought to be taken first, and then we can move toward more subtle tasks and examinations of more subtle phenomena. Therefore, it would be easier to start by looking at phenomena outside of our own culture than starting within our own culture. When querried, MacLeod stated further that he would prefer students to observe falling bodies or practices in different cultures rather than the behaviors of peers or younger students within their own culture. Explicitly stated, the assumption that MacLeod is making is that curiosity more naturally points itself outward than inward.

There was considerable controversy and disagreement with this position. Lippitt, in particular, felt that it just might work the other way around.

McKeachie tried to take a stand midway between Lippitt and MacLeodon this issue. He felt that while material in the physical sciences might indeed be easier to look at objectively, it was not as salient and involving to the student as some issues in social science. Moreover, one of the things possible in social science is the sense of private discovery that students can make. Many experiments in the physical sciences are so dry and easily replicable that they don't seem to be anything very exciting. In the social sciences, discovery is something that each child can make for himself, and therefore, the learning is likely to be very important to him. In this respect, MacLeod felt that when youngsters discuss personal experience and motivation they are too often led to easy labeling, simplifications and mislearning that needs to be corrected later on.

Miller summarized part of this early discussion by distinguishing between two issues we were dealing with (1) the issue of cognitive clarity which would suggest that we start outside of the student with objectively observable events that can be clearly discriminated and discussed and, (2) the issue of involvement or salience in which we might start more realistically with issues that are close to the student and very involving and important to him. These two ways of proceeding are not necessarily contradictory; and Miller himself felt it would be more important to start with involving and salient issues. Miller proceeded to give some examples of concrete and non-abstract phenomena that were very involving to the individual and at the same time permit clarity of observation and description. One appropriate issue was "identity" or "self". Structure of self, self-esteem and self-defenses can be illustrated with cross-cultural examples, cross-generational experiences, or case material from pathology. MacLeod suggested that examples from pathology might lead to a kind of more morbidity that might be more depressing and not useful. Lippitt suggested that looking at observable events or people in interaction might be more lucid than examining dry or abstract case studies. In general, this use of self as an example represents Miller's notion that you can teach the more abstract concepts in very concrete ways.

McKeachie suggested that he would like to teach about man as an organism that is curious and a "stimulus seeker". This notion might be related to man's biological and bio-social nature and could easily lead into a discussion of the phylogenetic continuity and discontinuity of man as a bio-social being. The reticular activating system, a mediator and generator of stimuli, would be an example of a relevant physiological mechanism. McKeachie went further in his concern to supply students with an image of man as a purposive being, and not as a puppet completely determined. Man should be seen as a being interacting with other men and with the biological, physical and social environment.

A third example of a topic was the study of language and symbols. MacLeod felt very strongly that language ought not to be taught as a task, but as one manifestation of man's attempt to communicate with other men. In studying language as a communicative act, students might look at other means of communication. They may perform exercises and experiments in the use of physical gestures, and other non-verbal means of expression.

A fourth topic involved the investigation of behavioral differences, and more particularly the effects of the social environment upon behavior. Looking at the effects of different social environment on behavior and the divergence of such behavior is one example of this topic. A second example might involve looking at how a constant or similar social stimulus may lead to different kinds of behavioral outcomes. These avenues might provide good learning about the interaction between the social environment and personal predispositions, the determination of styles and patterns of behavior.

Miller suggested another topic, that of social perception. An important lesson to be taught here is how people organize their perceptions of things in terms of their needs and desires. Social class is seen as an influence upon the individual's organization of material in the environment. The phenomena of social perception can be demonstrated by the relationship between needs, position and status and the perception of color or matter. This kind of examination might lead to the collection of various experimental data in or out of the classroom and the actual replication of certain experiments in social perception. There are many examples of optical illusions and other perceptual experiments that might be fun and very fruitful for classroom replication. Role playing could also be used to dramatize social events and see how they are perceived by different students.

MacLeod suggested that we teach students to understand other people at a fundamental level of psychological similarity and difference. This would involve not only looking at different cultures and different customs, but understanding the psychological functions of certain customs. For instance, a class might review the psychological import of puberty rituals while cataloging a variety of different customs accompanying its onset in different cultures. Minor's article on the NACERIMA might be a good example here.

These last two suggestions are related to one another since part of the examination of different cultures might be the review of the influence of culture on perceptions. For instance, MacLeod noted his experience that people in Africa do not know what a screw or a mirror is, or do not have trouble with the trapezoidal window experiment.

Miller suggested the topic of learning, and expressed some of his own concern about how this topic could be made both clear and salient for high school students. McKeachie suggested that each student could be given a rat to train, and thus see how rats learn. We all felt that any program that started with the discussion of rats would necessarily have to deal with the difficulty of generalizing from rats to people. As we discussed this further, we agreed on learning as an important part of all behavior. All behavior acts can be seen as examples of the process of learning. This led us to see the need for high school people to understand the variety of learning styles and reinforcers that are available to them both externally and internally. Man is constantly attempting to maintain and change his status, and thus tension underlies all of learning.

At this point in our discussion we moved to a review of some of the major methodological principles or orientations we wanted to be sure that high school people received in a social science course. MacLeod felt that a first priority was to learn how to look. The issue here is to train students to look at the facts, to clarify the phenomena they are talking about. We can move from looking at the phenomena to some of the more precise issues of the categorization and quantification of phenomena. McKeachie felt strongly that precise quantification was not as important as skill in categorization or nominal quantification. One of the problems in graduate education in psychology seems to be to deal with the student's orientation towards a very precise quantification in situations where it is simply not appropriate.

MacLeod suggested a second principle, for students to be aware of implications and unstated assumptions. He suggested some logical or mathematical games which could highlight this assumption-making process. Lippitt felt that games were not necessary and that there were many "life" examples which could be used to review implicit assumption making.

A third issue here was for students to understand the principle of order in the environment, and to see the relationship between order and causation. We all felt it was important to teach multiple causation and not simple causal relationships. In discussing multiple causality, Lippitt gave an example of the elementary school teacher and the "chalk dropping" exercise. This is an exercise in which the teacher writing on the black board drops a piece of chalk and asks the class to explain why that happened. The class comes up with a multitude of explanations all of which may be operant.

Another methodological orientation is that students see human relationships as studiable and see studying human relationships as having positive value for them. Another methodological principle Miller wanted emphasized was for students to be taught the terms and relevance of the developmental stages in psychology. A final principle is that we ought not to promote the specialization of students too early. They ought to see the social world as a whole, as a reality, and not fragmented into its various sub-specializations which deprive it of its reality. A major theme running through our discussion of method was the need to make methodological lessons or interventions very explicit. In this way students could distinguish between methodology and content in social science.

We then decided to focus for the remaining period on the delineation of the frontiers of knowledge in psychology. We wanted to see what kinds of new developments were going on, what kinds of new and exciting projects our consultants knew about or were working on. Our thought was that these new frontiers might provide the basis for a curriculum in psychology and the social sciences. MacLeod began by explaining his interest in the study of thinking and the comparative study of thinking and higher thought processes through the study of language. Part of his interest in this field is due to his notion that symbolic communication is really a quality this is unique to men. Beyond that, language is one of a variety of ways man conveys meanings to other men. This conception of the process of communication could lead very well into Meadian notions of symbolic interaction as the basis for social interaction. MacLeod thought it was important to get students interested in the words they use and their own patterns of language. One of the ways of doing this might be for the students to learn an artificial language, or to learn to communicate without words. At the graduate level, MacLeod has his students invent a perfect language, or a language that satisfies psychological needs of diction and symbolic communication. Looking at word equivalents across different languages might be an excellent way of studying language and cultural differences. MacLeod thought it was crucial for teachers of languages in high school to be aware of these possibilities and psychological insights in language training. In many ways our own language is so obsolete and full of redundancy, that its examination could be an exciting exercise for high school students.

McKeachie felt that another area of great excitement, another frontier, was recent work in patterns of interaction between people. Balance theory and identity theory by Newcomb, Heider, and Miller were some of the major models in this area. A study of patterns of interaction may lead into issues of circular and multiple causation, and examples of flexibility and change in persons. One of the ways of getting at these areas might be to have all the children observe "youngers" in a variety of situations, and see how behavior is different in different situations. This may be a dramatic example of interaction between persons, and between persons and their environment.

McKeachie felt it was important to teach the notion of dynamics of personal and interpersonal life--that children see themselves and each other as always changing and having a potential for change. The process of mediating between inner needs and environmental pressures can be seen as a major determinant for behavior. In this context an attitude held toward another individual is not a demonstration of need but an example of how the other person appears to the perceiving individual. The interaction between this perception and the need associated with it might be examined as a way to deal with both social perception and social interaction in the classroom.

Another major frontier suggested was the investigation of the biological and physiological limits on human behavior, and the possibilities for the expansion of these limits through drugs, training, and new kinds of genetic control. The influence of biology and physiology upon psychological feeling states and behavior would be an interesting avenue for students to explore.

The fourth major area we got into was the new development in mathematical sociology. Along with this we discussed development in simulation exercises, games, and other experiences as ways of learning social psychological and psychological principles.

Miller felt that another important area was that of motivation. Issues of conflicts between different motives, aspirations, and frustration were most interesting areas for him. Perhaps more interesting to students might be some of the social motivation issues, such as a need for achievement, needs for affection, need for power, and the like, that are found in Atchinson's system. Relating this back to some of our earlier orientations we emphasized the need for students to see motivation not only in inherent bio-physical needs, but also arising out of social structure and interaction with other people. The interaction of the environmental, social relational, and bio-physiological needs produce a multiple notion of behavioral causation. Along with motivation, of course, came the other major traditional areas of perception and learnings, both of which we talked about a little earlier.

A final area that McKeachie suggested was the relationship between social structure or cultural framework and personality. Throughout these six or eight areas we constantly talked about starting with things that were real to the students and then moving to more abstract and analytic frameworks and concepts.

As a final note, we spent much time during this meeting talking about the relevance of psychology as a formal and separate discipline in the school, or psychology as an intervention in other disciplines in the school or psychology really as a kind of training that ought to be given to teachers. MacLeod felt that too much time is spent at the college level now in teaching about psychology, when we should be teaching more of the physical and natural sciences, literature and the humanities, and mathematics. The major contribution of psychology to education, he felt, lies in the training of teachers, not in establishing a separate curriculum. We ought to train teachers to be curious about the psychological relationships of man, then this kind of concern would infuse their teaching and many of their activities in the classroom. The result would be that students would become psychologically sophisticated about a variety of topics rather than sophisticated about some particular content in psychology. In this context of seeing psychology as a supplement to other disciplines, McLeod talked about the relevance of psychological insights in literature, in the humanities and the arts, in analysis of language as an example of communicative acts.

In reviewing our own process, and the "Statement of the Problem", Miller felt the topic in itself was potentially blocked because of some of the resource people's lack of knowledge of high school students and curriculum. Therefore, it might be difficult for them to focus on this issue. We debated whether it would be best to start with this focus on the high school course, or with a focus on the new and exciting developments in particular fields of knowledge. Last week, for instance, people were able to focus on the basic question with great fruitfulness because they felt sophisticated about the adolescent world and adolescent needs. Perhaps the best alternative is to start the way we have; but before we go too far into the meeting, we ought to push in the other direction and see what kinds of new and exciting developments that are in the fields being discussed.

SESSION 4

SOCIAL SCIENCE APPLICATION

The consultants for this session were Professors Menlo, Rothman and Thomas.

Menlo suggested that a focus for social science curriculum development be that of identifying methodologies, approaches, and strategies for changing behavior. This would include looking at conditions that facilitate and hinder change and at what the various outcomes of such efforts are known to be. Both intra and inter personal systems, and systems of relationships would be involved. The change target here is considered universal. One would aim for an objectively value free orientation.

Under social power, one would aim to bring out the implication of various uses of power, and awareness of what happens to individuals who are part of the system in which particular kinds or uses of power occur.

It was noted that the orientation here is one of integrating the content from various fields of social science. It was seen as a process of selecting different concepts from fields as they seemed relevant to change. For example perception would not seen to be relevant to a social psychology curriculum.

Menlo felt that problem solving was closely related to the change process. He therefore felt that it was important for some frameworks to be developed so that problem solving approaches could be diagnosed and evaluated.

Rothman felt that a study of social systems should be included. Benne, Chin et.al., were mentioned as a reference here.

Menlo suggested that helping children become familiar with the whole idea of research would be useful especially if they developed an awareness of how active research solves problems. This could acquaint them with the idea that the life process itself is really an action research process. Action research would be seen as a sub-part of research which deals especially with change. Problem solving experiences and illustrations could be developed relevant to the classroom, the school, and the community. Initially it should involve the pupils collecting data to solve problems that are immediately relevant to themselves.

It was suggested that level of abstraction is particularly important when starting to choose content or teaching method. It was suggested that one start at the level which is most relevant and most easily identifiable by the student. It might be best to start with an example involving some decision making in the classroom. One could then look at the generalizations to family and community. Concepts of role and the family could be raised and then the students could look at their own families. Role might be a useful topic either in itself or within some other area.

This is an assumption that certain material is threatening and therefore will not be learned well. It was noted that there was also a vigilance problem. The latter would suggest that material that has some threat can often be learned and integrated best. It may well be that some of the problem that one gets into in the area of caution about what concept should be taught is based on the controversial nature of the concept itself rather than simply the notion that it may give rise to misapplications or traumatic experience as one thinks of it in relation to oneself.

The discussion turned again to the question of general focus of this curriculum development. It was restated that the focus might best be that of the application of social science to changing of behavior. It was noted that such a focus could be applied on a macro level or micro level. One desired to present the material so that it cut across both the micro and macro levels, then it was felt that such a cross focus would need to be planned for from the beginning.

The question of what are currently exciting topics for each of the consultants in his field at the present time was raised. Rothman noted that power structure and social power as discussed earlier was one.

Thomas stated that he is particularly intrigued by the "behavioristic" approaches to changing behavior. He felt that many people have been ignoring these approaches recently, but that new worthwhile work is being done in this area. His interest includes current work in behavioristic psychotherapy. This approach has been supported by a good deal of laboratory research. Van Buren and Walter's book, Social Learning and Personality Development, was mentioned. Van Buren had a paper in the psychology bulletin a couple of years back called, Behavioristic Therapy. There is also a paper called, Imitation and Modeling in the Nebraska symposium. Eysenck had edited a volume of papers on behavioristic psychotherapy of the neurosises. There is a book by Walpee called, Reciprocal Inhibition in Psychotherapy. Thomas thought this latter to be a very good book. There is a paper in a very recent issue of the Psychology

Bulletin which reviews the literature on behavioristic therapy.

Rothman stated his current interest in the area of social conflict and consensus in change. He noted the growing awareness of the constructive functions of conflict as opposed to the earlier striving for consensus. Conflict resolution was suggested as another broad topic for the course. It was suggested that it might be applicable at various levels of aggregation as would be the case with the topic of change.

The consultants were asked where they might begin in the teaching of a social science course to high school if they were to do it themselves. Menlo stated that he might well start with Pavlov and some things such as Weber's Law. He would then move on to Throndike and Skinner. The main topic here would be learning synonymously defined and behavioral change. He would prefer specific to general theory. He would select content where empirical backing existed for the ideas or concepts on theories. General theories would be seen as too general. He would prefer to use substantive theories and principles as opposed to integrating generalities.

Menlo mentioned that he felt there is quite a bit of exciting material now coming out of experimental social psychology where rigorous empirical methodology is being used. This would include topics such as alterism, dissonance, decision making and some of Shockeers study of the deviant. Lippitt and White's and Coleman's books were also mentioned.

It was questioned whether the curriculum should introduce students to an awareness of what and who social scientists are. This point was generally acceptable and it was suggested, it should form an early part of the course. Rationale for this would include its value in recruitment and its value in porviding early modeling experience.

The question of the organization of the content was now raised. Menlo looked at it from the standpoint of the topics and aggregates to which topics pertain. He noted that he has worked out a 4 x 5 chart which is discussed in a paper that he has recently written. The four points on one dimension include 1) change of influence; 2) natural developmental processes; 3) deviations, abnormalities, atypicalities, aborations and 4) normalities, typicalities, etc. The other dimension has the aggregates on it. They would include 1) the individual; 2) group; 3) organization; 4) community and 5) society. He noted that in teaching we tend to start with the lower aggregates and work up assuming that this was the best approach.

The question of where value would enter into this content was raised. It was noted that the substance of the field and the engineering aspects of application of any of this substance are different fields. It was felt that values and ethics affected the structure of the curriculum and teaching methods more than the substantive material in the field. In teaching about something like deviance, values, beliefs and norms become crucial topics.

SESSION 5

COGNITION

Our resource people at this meeting of the high school social science education team are Professors Burnstein and Zajonc. The topic for discussion is cognition and the part that cognition might play in an integrated social science course at the high school level.

Burnstein started off with an important principle that students conduct experiments during this course. Such experimentation, particularly the replication of well tested experiments, should be a highly involving and exciting way to learn. Both Bernstein and Zajonc felt that perhaps cognition should not be a topic all by itself, but better treated as part of a unit on learning. In the learning unit we could deal with neurological and physiological mechanisms in animals and man, and gradually move toward verbal learning, cognition and finally more complex problem solving. An interesting issue to focus on might be the development of concepts within the child and, in fact, the psychological meanings of concepts. It might be very fruitful, in the manner of Bruner, Austin and Goodenogh, to trace certain physical terms such as space or time and inquire into their psychological meaning for youngsters. As well as using physical terms, we might look at the learning of social relational concepts in the manner of Piaget or Heider. Children could look at what "friendship" or "anger" or "relationship" means, psychologically.

The question of whether to focus on physiological, neural or verbal learning may partly be resolved by understanding the nature of the high school into which we plan to introduce the material. For instance, if the high school is very strong in biology and chemistry, and has good laboratory space, then it makes sense to introduce a physiological or neurological learning course. It takes best advantage of the material and personnel resources available in that school. On the other hand, if the high school is rich in social science personnel and resources, it is quite reasonable to introduce a verbal and concept formation type learning course.

Since experimentation is a most important part of learning about learning, or learning about cognition, the consultants felt that starting from physiological and neurological material might be easier. It is easier to build well designed and well tested experiments in this area than in the social science or verbal learning area. The course could focus on experiments around classical conditioning and the Skinnerbox, proceed to discrimination learning or generalization learning, and gradually move toward experiments around concept formation, problem solving, or decision making. In as many instances as possible these experiments should be done either on animals or on other students in their own or other classrooms.

We all agreed that some kind of manual for the teacher was a good idea, and that we could build an entire course on experiments. But some felt that there was no reason why these experiments could not be of a social science type from the very beginning. Problem solving and decision making could include voting behavior or economic behavior as well as social-interaction, and conformity experiments. Students could learn the scientific method by polling themselves, their peers, and their parents. They could then report back the poll results in class. The general issue here is that in all cases the data and phenomena of life are seen to be capable of being studied. They follow certain rules of cause and effect.

Zajonc felt that in all cases these experiments should be well designed and well tested to insure that they cannot fail and that they will come out the way that the literature states. There was some disagreement about this. Other people in the group felt that this might tend to replicate dry and sterile discovery experiences for the children. In fact, it might be well to do experiments when we did not know the answer. In this way students may find their own answers to the way they behave with one another and some social phenomena in the classroom. Well proven experiments may rob the children of discovery experiences, the creation of new and rich kinds of design on their part. One way suggested to resolve this argument may be to start small with the Skinnerbox and classical conditioning, and gradually move to more complex social oriented and discovery type phenomena.

A "cookbook" manual with many experiments might permit the teacher to do them blindfolded with very little extra training. Some of the social experiments that might be included in such a laboratory manual are experiments on social perception, influence, and causality. Perhaps, also, the famous Trapezoidal illusion, the autokinetic effect, and some of Festinger's work on dissonance and dissonance reduction. One example of some dissonance experiments could be some stuff we have already tried out and know about, for instance, some of the material on smoking and cancer that Erlick has done or some of the material about information and dissonance reduction after decision making. A very relevant topic might be the relationship between time spent studying and performance, particularly in terms of levels of aspiration and expectation of grades.

A high school class might work on smaller children and look at how younger students see and learn about physical causation and phenomena as a way of learning about how they, themselves, see it. Another area might be linguistics and verbal transfer, particularly if we have already looked at verbal learning and verbal generalization. It would then be easy to move over into semantic operations. Rommetveit's material on symbol recognition and language, gets at the social meanings of symbols.

One other area that might be very interesting to look at involves the link between biological and social processes. We talked about drugs and about looking comparatively across animals and humans. We might also look at imprinting, with perhaps some movies as well as slides of imprinting experiments. Further, some of McConnel's work on the flatworms might be interesting and useful to students. Other material on cognitive processes and physiological processes includes looking at lie detectors, LSD, and other aspects of psychopharmacotogical and placebo effects.

Throughout the discussion, there was general agreement that we ought not to spend much time giving high school students grand theory or large scale generalizations. This was principally because many major theories are really unsubstantiated by any serious and empirical findings at this point. Any theory or empirical generalization that we do give them ought to be easily observable and ought to be something that they themselves could experiment on. If they cannot experiment with it or if it is invisible and speculative then we really ought not to give it to the class.

At this point in our discussion we decided to move away from being concerned particularly about high school courses and ask our consultants about the frontiers of knowledge in their fields. What are the things that are exciting that are happening now, that look like the new and promising areas for the developments of knowledge? There are many new things coming out in the area of psycholinguistics, linguistic analysis and the use of linguistic diversity as a variable in performance and cognition. There are many new areas where we may apply linguistic analysis to understand human social behavior at the symbolic as well as conditioning level. Issues such as word frequency, word meaning, and degree of word repetition are some important examples. There are also many new developments in the measurement of cognitive style and the understanding of cognitive biases. Work needs to be done on the way that these styles are related both to the work of psycholinguistics as well as other aspects of behavior. Desoto and Kuethe are on this frontier.

Schacter is doing fascinating work on the interaction of cognitive states and the physiological states. He shows how behavior reflects the way cognitive style and verbal input modify and interpret the physiological state. We also have here the example of how social norms and notions of "appropriateness" can influence physiological input and the effect of physiological input on behavior.

Further, it appears from the literature that reinforcement theory as a theory of learning and social development is about on its way out. Some other theory such as cognitive theory is going to take its place. Parallel to this some of Bandura's work suggests that learning theory will be applied to the analysis of socialization to a much greater extent than it has been MacKinnon and Hinley, at Bryn Mawr, have recently done a laboratory manual we might look at. The design here would involve a highly structured text with many experiments that could demonstrate a single lesson. In this way we might minimize the amount of extra teacher training required.

SESSION 6

LEARNING

Professor Melton acted as consultant for this session.

The first question that was raised was the purpose of developing a high-school level social science curriculum. It was noted that there might need to be differences in such a curriculum dependent on whether the high school students were college-bound or terminal. It was suggested that every person needs some understanding of the basic mechanisms of behavior. This should be done at least to the extent that people do not ascribe behavior to mysterious forces.

Some aspects of learning are now being treated in the teaching of biological sciences. Some demonstrations of learning experiments are to be seen currently in science fairs. Classical and operant conditioning processes are being treated in some high school courses in the biological sciences. It was noted that while this may be true, such topics as in current courses are relatively rare and generally isolated to the college bound student.

It was suggested that we are to work on focusing on social learning in so far as it deals with learning processes. Classical and operant conditioning in the area of social learning should be dealt with. Imitation in learning such as dealt with in the work on Van Duren would be important. The importance of imitation as an origin of learning was emphasized. Examples of this imitation in social learning such as in the family and also in the classroom could be focused upon. A package drawing upon the experimentation in this area could be developed. The move here would be from empirical work to generalizations for the behavior that pupils see around themselves. Older children might observe younger children as one way of illustrating the principles that are involved. The purpose of such learning was seen as that of gaining a better understanding of individual behavior or what some might call personality.

The question of whether a little knowledge may be a dangerous thing was raised. The point could be made that things learned about learning in biological experimentation and class work could be viewed in this curriculum in the context of human learning or social learning. This would emphasize that such principles are generalizable and applicable in the behavior one sees in oneself and in those around one. An awareness which should result would be that we are very much the product of our environment. An approach to understanding individual behavior based on learning theory might be relatively safe and non-dramatic as compared to involving pupils in some of the more esoteric theories, such as that of psychoanalysis.

Three concepts of social learning theory that were suggested as the basis of curriculum developed concerning learning were as follows: 1) Imitation: that is, learning by the observation of others. Van Duren makes a good case for this by the most important origin of new response patterns, both promedical and deviant. It is not trial-and-error and it is not guided learning usually. It is incidental learning through observation of others. 2) Reinforcement: the second factor is the reinforcement of behavior as it is emitted, habits getting shaped and strengthened through this reinforcement. There are a variety of reinforcements that can operate. 3) Non-reinforcement: the occurance of non-reinforcement affects the discontinuance of behaviors. It causes disorganization of behavior patterns.

It was suggested that this approach ties in with what are thought of, or called, human motivations. This could include notions such as those of the creation of human needs. It was suggested that Jack Atkinson or Dave Birch would be good persons to talk to in this area.

Melton felt that the three concepts mentioned in the area of social learning should be the basis of curriculum around learning, not because of their being simple, but rather because of their being most important. Focus on phenomena such as memory or ideas of massed versus distributed practice were felt to be of much lesser importance and questionable validity. The relationship between the non-reinforcement and reinforcement of ongoing operant behaviors, on the other hand, was seen as most relevant. Also important would be the origin of behaviors. Some of them are deliberate modeling. Less deliberate or unconscious modeling would be very important. It should be noted that there are some other origins of behavior along with that of imitation.

It should be recognized that there are genuinely new understandings and modes of behavior and organizing information such as in the results of creative problem solving. Instructions, on the other hand, would be modeling in which the model deliberately serves as a model. Less obvious imitation could be illustrated by experiments which demonstrate operant verbal conditioning. This would include things such as increasing or reducing the use of adjectives. This kind of demonstration could be carried out by a class using members of naive classes as subjects. Demonstration of some of these reinforcement effects could be set up in the classroom, but caution was advised in experimentation with the behavior of other pupils.

One awareness that was seen as important centered around the fact that we start processing information input at a very early age as we imitate different models presented to us. This results in selective storage of different awarenesses.

At this point we turned to the question of what is currently exciting in the work on learning to Melton. Melton noted that one thing that has been emerging in the past five years that is of considerable interest to him lies in the area of associative learning as distinguished from problem solving. Associative learning is seen as involved in problem solving.

It has been recognized that the best experimental example of associative learning is in the area of verbal learning. Melton made three points; 1) Verbal learning is being found to offer great advantages of limiting and controlling variables and of identifying them. What is being learned can be restricted to that which is a new relationship between old well-learned effect, on to the learning of connections between new factors. Stimulus, predifferentiated stimulus, differentiated stimulus learning on one side of the picture, and response intergration on the other side; these things can be analyzed and dealt with. 2) Several components of associative learning are being differentiated and labeled, such as: complex relationships, stimulus learning or perceptual learning; response interpretation;and associative relationships. 3) Some of the fundamental characteristics of storage or memory are being identified in short memorization experiments. These new discoveries are very much involved with methodological advances. Some of the work of the physiological psychologists in their experimentation with animals is having an effect here. The psychologists are finding that there is a necessary period of consolidation of learning. The insight is that every learning combination of the associative process, as a study of learning, had been approached in the past, mainly from the standpoint of the retention process... Identifying the associative processes and looking forward to applying them to more complex learning situations is quite new.

Melton suggested that the approach to high school curriculum development in the area of learning theory should not be one of demonstrating the supposed relative efficiency of different kinds of learning. He felt that not enough was known in order to be able to validly take this kind of approach. The approach that he suggested would use cases to illustrate empirically-based points. These could be in the form of classroom demonstrations and also could involve bringing in data that the pupils observed outside the classroom. He noted further that the nature of generalizations should be explored. This might be conceived of in terms of the level of knowledge reflected in empirically-based principles. The question of teaching was raised and it was suggested that materials could be developed in such a way that a comparatively untrained teacher could handle them, and that some emphasis could also be directed toward increased training of teachers.

SESSION 7

SMALL GROUPS

Our resource people for this session are Professors Kahn and Seashore. The general topic for discussion is the social environment of small groups. Seashore began by reviewing a dilemma regarding the objectives of a high school social science course. He noted that one objective was to move in the direction of socially therapeutic goals and content for the course - material that would be useful in changing individuals' behavior and permitting them to live and work more successfully in social groups and organizations. Another objective, on a more abstract level, was to learn the concepts, methods and materials of social science. This latter goal principally would train young people to be social scientists rather than training them to enter into effective relationships in groups. Nimroth suggested that probably students needed both of these directions, since some of the students are terminal and others are going on to college. The range of students probably need not only to be trained to perform effectively in groups, but also need some analytic skills in understanding and working in social science.

Kahn suggested three general objectives he would have in teaching to high school students. 1) Examine with the students the "meaning" of membership in small groups, and to look at the relationship between the individual and the group. He felt that it was important in this context for the individual to understand some of the rewards and costs of membership in a group and some of the limitations as well as growth possibilities that exist for the individual. 2) Understand how the group is a powerful force in shaping individual behavior and influencing the structure of personality. This influence of group upon personal behavior and personality is a continuing process, so that in many ways we might describe the person as a product of group influences. 3) And last, have the student see that certain groups and institutional characteristics are themselves malleable, modifiable, and changeable by acts and intentions of individuals. In fact, individuals can change not only the nature of group life, but often the very structure of groups and organizations. This last point is often overlooked not only in much of our research but in much of our teaching. Seashore elaborated on part of the second objective, by noting that actually personality and personal characteristics are constantly changing. In this context we can more easily understand that this continuing process of personality formation is partly the result of situational and group influences.

Some additional objectives were added by the consultants in the course of our discussion. Seashore emphasized a focus on the immediate forces on behavior and the minimization of the historical or developmental approach to explaining social events. Kahn added a fifth, a constant attempt to link conceptual and experiental learning. The experiental concern here is to train teachers to use immediate materials available in the classroom rather than being frightened and running away from them. The integration of the curriculum into the life experiences of the child, the examination of immediate behavioral events and feelings, the possible use of the classroom group as the data for social scientific study, are examples of ways of linking conceptual learning about groups to the feelings and experiences related to these concepts. As an alternative or an addition we might prepare case studies which help to slowly move untrained or frightened teachers to dealing with the more immediate events in the classroom. Kahn introduced another objective of a course, that the high school students be encouraged and trained to get inside and understand their own motivations and the causes of their own behavior. This concern grows directly out of the link between conceptual and experimental learning and suggests the need for students to understand themselves and the internal and external forces that cause their behavior. Seashore felt that it would be important to include as an adjunct to course content some form of laboratory activities and skill training. This is important so students can feel and practice some of the issues we think are important about small groups. Such a laboratory focus would also facilitate the conceptual-experiental link suggested earlier.

The consultant team now turned to a discussion of some of the key social science concepts that are important to introduce into the high school classroom. Kahn suggested the need for a general familiarity with some of the issues around conflict resolution. There is a need to review alternatives to the common thinking about conflicts as a zero sum game, where there is one winner and one loser, where there is one white and one black side and where the stakes are not divisible. Kahn felt that so much of the next generation's problems around war, intergroup relations, and family and community process depend upon the young people understanding alternative strategies for conflict reduction and resolutions, that this was very important to introduce into the classroom. A second issue closely connected here is for young people to understand how conflict can be used creatively. Students should not be taught only to resolve conflicts, but also how to use conflict to generate growth or change in static or stagnant organizations and situations.

Another series of concepts suggested by Seashore were social power, authority, and status. These three can be lumped together since they are closely tied to the kinds of roles people play in organizations. They are also variables that are observable in the classroom group, and easily related to the kinds of behavior kids engage in in the classroom group. Parenthetically, these concepts are also relevant to the family and work group. Furthermore, they grow right out of Kahn's concern about conflict resolution since social power, authority, and status are often the greatest generators of conflicts in organizations. As a dramatic example, one can raise the question of how an underprivileged, underpowered minority like the teenager can deal with an overprivileged authority like the parent. Here is a model then of intergenerational conflict that may be helpful to students looking at intergroup conflicts in the total society.

Kahn suggested a number of other key concepts relevant to conflict management and problem solving: change, compromise, integrated solutions, and acceleration of conflicts. There are other terms from system theory, that help us look at social systems such as: sub-systems, superordinant systems, system dynamics, space, distance, structure, function, boundary. Others mainly from group dynamics include: power and control, decision making, communication, leadership, attraction and cohesion, role and values.

Many of these conflicts can be considered simultaneously as aspects of persons, of interpersonal situations, or of things that go on within a small group or organization. The consultatns agreed that one could start either with these concepts and organize a course around them, or start with some raw and experiental phenomena, and gradually move to looking at some of these concepts to explain the phenomena. In either case, we would organize a course along disciplinary lines, along the traditional lines of the university or scientific pie cutting. An alternative is to organize along the lines of certain kinds of life experiences or life processes.

Throughout this list of key concepts we seem to come back to several central ones such as: mutual and multiple cause and effect, multiple determinism, interaction, interdependence, and change. One basic concern of the consultants is developing some language across disciplinary lines, and across life processes. Hopefully, we can then use technical terms and concepts in ways that are useful to the feelings and life experiences of high school students. One of the problems in talking about key concepts or organizing key concepts has been just such a problem of language. Our consultants have no objections to the use of scientific terminology and models such as the field force, life space, etc., if they were used in such a way that made them relevant and clear to the student. They were not concerned that learning these terms and models at the high school level would necessitate unlearning or confusion later on. In this respect they disagree with Cartwright's position in one of our earlier sessions when he objected to the use of Lewinian models and concepts with high school students.

The consultants decided to shift for a while to a discussion of some of the strategies for getting such concepts across, some teaching methodologies. First of all there will have to be some specific discussion of theory or content, particularly of such a thing as conflict resolution. It is necessary to give students more sophisticated and complex input beyond the normal myths or simplified explanations that are in vogue. Secondly, it is helpful for students to think about new and different alternatives for dealing with a given event or behavioral situation. And some of these alternatives can actually be tested in behavior as well as considered conceptually. There is a need for some problem solving demonstrations using vivid contemporary material rather than historical events and materials. A problem solving concern could be used to look at the "here and now" and at the current community. Students might examine some of the parallels between the here and now of the classroom group and the small group in the family and the community. The whole T-group quality of making the problems to be solved the here and now problems of the people in the present group can be used. It is an important method to introduce into the classroom, and an important way of proceeding in learning social science material. As an example, students might look at patterns of dating and exclusion right in the classroom group. To get a little further away from this students could do content analyses of newspapers or of community processes in the classroom. In an attempt to dramatize community problems and bring them into class for study they might attempt surveys of the community. Any variety of conflicting input brought into the classroom could be used as an example of how to deal with conflicts. In using such surveys, the teacher can lay out certain problems for the students to deal with, and at the same time take advantage of the kind of problems the students think they want to discuss. By designing their own surveys students can help determine curriculum content, or the specific problem to be the content of curriculum attention.

Seashore suggested there be a place in the course to look at the front page of the community newspaper. Kahn made the following suggestion in this context: students might listen to two conflicting news commentators broadcasting about the same event or editoralizing about the same controversial issue. Then students might analyze the content of both these programs, thereby learning some things about the social scientific process, namely, the comparative process and the possibility of objectifying subjective events. Furthermore, they would learn something concretely about the social issues that are being discussed. Radio commentators, newspaper reports and opinion journals, are all appropriate material for this kind of study. Attendance at, observation of, and reports from the city council meetings can be another example of this process.

Several suggestions were made to ease the teacher's burden in this process. Some outside special interest groups might be utilized as resources here, either presenting things in the classroom or providing materials to students. In some cases parental help may be possible. Particularly in a university community such as Ann Arbor, parents, educators and social scientists may be able to come into the classroom and help out. And, students may be given personal projects that they can work on throughout the semester.

At this point in our session we decided to move on to looking at some of the frontiers of social scientific knowledge. Seashore suggested that one frontier was the new look at how social process and relationships in small groups and organizations affect not only organizational efficiency, but the physiological and mental health of the individuals within. A second frontier was some of new kinds of thinking and conceptions of the goals of social organizations. Greater sophistication in this area has led the social scientist to consider that any organization has a multiplicity of goals. Therefore, different parts of the organization have goals that may be independent or instrumental to the goals of the embracing organization. Understanding this multiplicity permits us more successfully to look at and to assess goal movement, and to develop multiple indicators for organizational success, goal movement or status. This is particularly relevant for high school students. They can look at the multiple goals of the classroom or of the school in terms of the aims and practices of the boards of education, supervisors, teachers, and students.

Kahn suggested another frontier, that of simulation. This development has permitted previously speculative or abstract and historical kind of work to be empirically tested. Along with this, we have seen the development of computerization and the mathematical description of social units and social processes. Further, and closely connected to the possibilities of mathematical treatment, is the possibility of viewing social structures as another step in the development of biological systems. We may now look at the parallels between social and physical or social and biological systems. In general, general system theory is appropriate to investigate here.

Another frontier area suggested was the concern for problems of freedom and conformity expressed in research being done by people like Ash and Milgram. They are working on the personal and psychological preconditions for freedom, for conformity, and for obedience to peer and authority systems. Along with such concerns for freedom and choice, scientists are doing a lot of developmental work on ways of bringing about change. This concern operates at the individual level and, of course, at the organizational level. We know a lot about change now and we ought to teach and explore some of the strategies for change. Some of the strategies that are worthwhile learning about extend from coercion through persuasion and exhortation. A lot of the possibilities in between are counseling, T-group work, psychotherapy, drugs and physiological measures and brainwashing. There are also ways that operate at the sociological and macro-systems level, such as legislation, educational system change, norm change, etc. We are almost at the stage now where we can pretty much engineer the kinds of human behavior and motives that we want, so this is a critical area to learn about. Partly, it is important to learn about because of the future potential that is involved, and because of the potential future public reaction to scientific expertise in this area.

A final frontier in this very sensitive change area is the new technological feasibility of providing a community feedback about itself and about the things it does. Sometimes we can do that and predict what will happen even before the community does it. Sometimes we give feedback afterwards. One thing involved here is making new links between the sources of knowledge and the users or receivers of knowledge. An example here is the election procedure, where we pretty much know ahead of time who is going to vote for whom, how it will come about, and why. What is the effect of giving pre-election feedback about this process? Further, what is the effect of giving teachers feedback and new information about their classrooms and teaching styles?

SESSION 8

ORGANIZATIONS

Professors Maier, Hoffman, and Mann acted as consultants for today's investigation of organizations. One approach suggested was that of comparing the advantages and disadvantages of being in a group. This could include looking at group problem-solving as compared to individual problem-solving. Strengths and weaknesses could be compared. For example, within group problem-solving there is liable to be more disagreement, therefore yielding more possible solutions. Laboratory type experimentation or demonstration could be used to explore this.

Some possible purposes for developing the social science curriculum were discussed. One would be to get across the idea that people as well as one might study physical objects. It was suggested that this curriculum should be relevant to college bound as well as terminal pupils. Following from this, one might best develop this curriculum from experience close to the students. It was suggested that decision-making might be a good focus with an underlying purpose, exploring what the democratic process is. One should look at how procedures and norms affect a group's decision making. One could ask, "what are problems and values you have experienced in groups?" A simultaneous purpose could be that of educating people about how to work within a group. If this latter were the purpose, one might best start by looking at the dimensions of groups. An important focus here would be that of looking at self, in terms of identity, in relation to multiple group membership and loyalties. A possible teaching method would be that of using case studies, also stories from fiction. Three possible objectives were enumerated at this point. They were to 1) raise interest in group phenomena 2) function better in a group and 3) proselytize in terms of interest in the phenomena, i.e., curiosity, on the basis of problem experiences, and on the basis of model exposure.

Baudas network experiment was suggested as one which could arouse curiosity. Schacter's experiment involving the deviant was another suggested. Concern about psychology being seen as manipulative was raised. It was felt that having stooges in experiments should be avoided. It was suggested, on the other hand, that something on manipulation should be presented so long as there was opportunity to explore the problems involved in manipulation. It should be brought out that the experimentor is part of the field. The different courses, or different curricula, with different objectives, might be offered to different student populations.

It was noted that a more objective approach can be taken as coming out of sociometry in which there is objective observation of group phenomena. This could be presented outside the manipulative context. Such phenomena as cliques, leadership, membership, the criteria of selection, and authority could be explored. These phenomena are very obviously apparent to students. They consequently tend to have great interest. Values cannot be separated from these phenomena and can be looked at profitably in discussion.

The phenomena of collusion was suggested as one worth looking at. This led to discussion of the family as a small group and therefore a good context within which to explore this. There is a need to present such material objectively. Miller and Westman's study on family collusion to produce a reading problem was cited. Teenagers very likely are not even aware of the fact that when they are in a family they are a member of a group. A complimentary topic to collusion was suggested as being that of the pluralistic ignorance in group phenomena which was identified by Shank and Katz study.

Another approach was suggested as embodied in the question, "what do you have to know about a person, personality wise, to predict his role in the group?" Discussion on this yielded a caution that this could lead to "slotting people". The group felt that this kind of approach should not be included. It was suggested that behavior is determined more by the situation than by the role that one is in. There was objection to using material such as that of Goffman on "presenting the self". It might be better to give a situation and then have the person play themselves rather than acting out a role. A problem here is that of allowing for deviations from role expectations. Playing the part of a role could raise stereotypes which could then be looked at. The self in the situation can yield demonstration of how your real self can act in that situation. It can also demonstrate that group members force individuals toward stereotype role behavior. Students tend to be very interested in exploring their various roles, e.g., as part of home room, class, lunch group, and recess. Ideas arise such as that of individuals getting stuck in roles such as clown, or brain.

Presentation of ideas on the evolution of groups was suggested. It was noted that groups have a "social reality" like a baby. Groups, like a baby, are initially rather nonfunctional. Groups evolve mechanisms which increase their ability to function. Mechanisms might include such things as decision processes, decision-making effectiveness, norms, criteria for effectiveness, roles, and status structures. The problems of an individual entering a group and finding a place and a way to contribute to the group could be examined. Also the problems of an individual leaving a group could be looked at. This raises the possibility of contrasting the experiences of groups. One could look at such things as the expectations within a group and also watch the process of change as, say, a classroom group meets over a period of time. An important phenomenon to study would be that of group members' sense of propriety over the group process. What initiative is taken by members of the group in terms of authority, autonomy, defiance? Rebellion can be a functional phenomenon in group development. You can also look at the developmental differences of individuals as it affects the experience in groups. Coleman's study of the high school culture could be used.

It was suggested that this curriculum should include something about animals' grouping as a natural phenomenon of life. For example, the flock of sheep, the herd of horses, the behavior of lemmings, the mores of baboons such as described in the Scientific American article by Washburn, leader and follower behavior such as the dominance among rats, chickens' pecking order, and so forth. This would raise a number of questions about the problems of group life.

Questions of sex is another point. This could include an approach such as that of the phenomena of going steady and of dating norms. It should be brought out that there are measurable regularities in groups. Looking at norms would raise the "free will" question and conformity phenomena. Don Marcus, for example, finds that groups take greater risks than individuals. The Army studies and Lewin's food-preference study could be used.

The discussion now turned to the current interests of the consultants. One of these interests focused on the interrelatedness of cognitive with effectiveness in group problem solving. It was felt that most groups operate at a very low level developmentally. People have great difficulty separating their ideas and their feelings. Work being done now which makes predictions of solutions of groups based on the interrelatedness of these two factors are pretty good. An index of this type has been worked out. A "threshold point" is reached when a solution becomes adopted.

Another interest is that of looking at groups as a source of influence in the organization. Groups with a certain composition, cohesion, etc., are most apt to exert influence.

More quantitative work is also going on. There interest is an increased liaison between the social and the clinical approach to studying groups. It was felt that there is currently a move from the Bales type categorization to more general inquiry or some system approaching a clinical analysis. The effort is to incorporate the clinician's analysis with small groups' categorizations. An integrative system is needed.

Experiments were suggested which could be replicated. Criteria for such experiments were suggested as being that they have results which were certain or that they involve interesting phenomena. The "truck problem" was suggested. The "horse-trading problem" was also suggested. However, the latter has only one answer, so that as word of it gets out it cannot be used again.

SESSION 9

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Professors Converse and Jennings were our consultants for Political Science in the Curriculum. Converse began by partially reporting a discussion that he had had sometime ago with a group of political scientists about the high school curriculum. In their discussions there were ten clusters of concepts and phenomena which they felt were important to cover. The first such cluster is one of values around citizenship, or teaching the democratic ethic. Here the aim is for the students to learn American values and inquire into the prophecies relevant to the maintainance of these values. Such topics as civil liberties, political tolerance, the place of civil disobedience, and in general the relationship between the individual and the government are to be explored in this first cluster.

A second important cluster is the processes of conflict and conflict management. At the macro-cosmic level, that is, at the level of institutional interaction of the society, Converse wanted students to learn that conflict is legitimate and that conflicts of interest are not necessarily bad. In fact, one can see the political system as a conflict management device. The political system maintains adherence to certain rules of the game, creates an outer bound of legitimate activity and a peaceful atmosphere within which conflict can take place. Jennings suggested at this point, that the two-party system is one example of a political system built to manage some degree of conflict peacefully. In this cluster, as in the ones that follow, Converse is deliberately trying to rise above the traditional political science curricula, and to look at the fundamental theoretical and conceptual problems. The curriculum that is ordinarily taught can be fit into this outline but the concern here is to rise above that curriculum which is primarily descriptions of the American society and its institutions. In addition to looking at fundamental and theoretical problems, we would also want to look at the specific institutional means that exist for putting these concepts into practice, both in the American and comparative social and political systems.

A third major cluster of concepts centers on problems of power and authority. Converse was concerned here with avoiding the mythical notion that power is only bad; and teaching that this fact of social life can be good and can be used for morally worthwhile ends. The two most crucial issues of power and authority appeared to be: 1) the relevance of power to the achievement of social goals, or the process by which individuals and collectivities organize to get power and exert power on other elements of the society in order to achieve certain self-interested goals.

A fourth cluster is status systems, and a look at authority and interpersonal relations in status systems and their pathologies. To extend status systems, we might also review formal organizations, both from a political and sociological point of view, and role formation and role sharing in democratic micro and macro systems. In addition to role interaction, we might also look at communication patterns, power distributions, and levels of satisfaction and productivity in formal organizations.

A fifth major area is that of representation systems, or the means which permit masses to communicate their wishes to an elite.

The concepts of the sixth cluster are those relevant to personal self-interest and the extension of self to membership in, and identification with, groups and collectivities. In this regard students might consider their levels of identification with local, regional, national, and international political units. Converse's major concern here was to counter some of the self-defeating aspects of self-interest, and to teach that sometimes self-interest may in fact, be enhanced by identification with broader collectivities. The whole topic of nationalism could be examined.

A seventh cluster is that of persuasion and influence at the macrocosmic level. In this area we might look at the way in which political and social institutions exert power and leverage on one another, in the attempt to get things done.

Converse suggested an eighth cluster, teaching about the philosophy of science. He felt that it was important to train young people to distinguish value from fact and both from inferences.

A ninth group is that of change and rates of change. The major point is that the structural systems we utilize in this country at this time are appropriate and relevant to this country at this time but may not be relevant to other countries, or even to this country at another time. Current forms and institutional arrangements change and we need to build into our society a way of preparing for such changes. For example, in doing a unit on change, take the constitution as basic data and look at the different ways the Constitution has been applied and interpreted over time. Another example, study the changing role and situation of the old people as a function of the change in the state of society, the changing population, and the nature of the family unit. We now have more old people, and a larger percentage of the population is increasingly estranged from their generational families and from meaningful employment in work. Therefore, our nation needs and students need to learn to think about new solutions and new ways of dealing with old people since their situation has changed so dramatically.

The tenth, and last cluster, suggested by Converse is a critical look at the role of social accident. For instance, there are many unseen consequences of certain social arrangements and social structure, and a lot of "slippage" of information in communication and intentions. There is a lot of ignorance and a lot of things we don't know about the proper way to organize social structures to carry out certain kinds of intention. The Depression, for instance, is an example of an unforseen consequence of certain kinds of social policy and social structure. In such a discussion students could learn about alternative views of causality and deal with some of the very simple and complex explanations for social events.

In most of the areas above we assume certain ends of political systems. In all these areas, certain kinds of means or institutions are established to deal with these ends. The typical course is now organized within an institutional framework and looks at certain forms; Converse is suggesting that we rearrange this to look at certain and fundamental processes and then proceed to the kinds of institutions that may relate to these. The purpose would be to understand the basic needs and social principles that underly some institutional forms. For instance, instead of teaching a unit on the United Nations, the United Nations could be integrated partly into the section on representation systems, partly into the section on conflict management systems, and partly into the section that deals with the extension of self to broader collectivities.

Jennings suggested that we think seriously about comparative analysis in the teachings of these concepts and phenomena. Too often, democratic values end up meaning naive loyalty to the current American state of affairs. It may well be that our current forms are not the best for everyone and particularly not for different nations who are at different developmental levels. This naive and chauvinistic value position is an important reason that Jennings wants to stress the comparative international historical and cross level approach to some of these phenomena. In teaching comparatively, Jennings suggested that we start at the local student government or local community level and gradually proceed to national and international examples. We might want to look at some extreme comparatives but more probably at several points on a continuum. Marich suggested that one way of looking at comparative systems might be to compare the American and communist systems. Jennings felt that this was particularly confusing since by communist we mean not only the political but certain economic forms as well. Most materials that are presently being used in communist courses in states throughout the nation are really an attempt to create a value position of anti-communism. The goal does not seem to be the creation of a sophisticated and scientific understanding of the nature of those political and economic systems. Comparative analysis should be taught with the use of films and many concrete examples to help in making these other cultures real. Moreover, the teacher can take a certain social process and look at the form it takes across cultures. Therefore, one would not teach a unit on France, but would study clusters of concepts such as the ten we have just outlined and included in our study some notion of the form and means that are used in France as well as in the United States. Another reason why the comparative approach is so important is that it is a fundamental tool for the political behavioral sciences, and therefore, students ought to learn it. Marich suggested, and the consultants agreed, that teachers are probably not yet prepared to teach in this manner.

Another major goal suggested is for students to become proficient in distinguishing between fact and policy. If students' values are clear, policies can be tested to see if they really represent or fulfill these values. This is also true about value orientations that are means values or values about processes as opposed to ends values or goals, because means values can be tested too, and we can look at the consequences of those means to see if the ends are congruent with the values of the means. Another principle relevant to scientific inquiry is the principle of multiple consequences. An act has many effects and our effects of maximizing one consequence leads to a bunch of side effects and many other consequences. One example of this is the history of the concept of freedom which is really the story of certain kinds of infringements and effects progressive restrictions being made on some peoples' freedom which have the side effects of opening up freedom for other people, and vice versa. For instance, restricting the free choice of store owners and restaurant owners actually opens up new kinds of rights and privileges for a vast number of other people. This helps us understand why the democratic process is a process of compromise not just in name, but in actuality. The constant tension in resolution of the maximizing efforts of different people is designed to create not a zero sum or win/lose situation, but a situation where everyone in this system gets a little bit of the goodies.

Converse suggested that another important area to him was the tendency of people to see social situations as zero sum situations where they could, in fact, be seen otherwise. People who look at things with short run perspectives, and the further away these situations are from one self, the more likely they are to stereotype, to minimize alternatives, and to see situations as a zero sum. A person who is dealing with something closer to him, is more intimately involved in a complex social or political situation is more likely to understand all the nuances and side effects. The negotiator rather than the masses, for instance, sees intergroup something other than a zero sum or win/lose situation. The example that Converse used is American attitudes toward foreign policy and foreign aid. The American public views anything that anyone else gets or anything that anyone else gains as a loss to ourselves. It is hard for us to see both ourselves and our "enemies" gaining from any situation. This is a perfect example of how a positive sum game is interpreted as a zero sum game.

Lippitt suggested that part of a unit might look at freedom, responsibility and compromise; and particularly at the meaning of compromise across culture. He noted that Americans react poorly to compromise situations, going in with the feeling that we are the "underdogs" and that we are going to get cheated. We feel beaten in any kind of a compromise, whereas the British are satisfied with much less in a compromise situation.

There are several teaching methods which may be used to illustrate and work on any of these content areas. The first is simulation, which may be a way of increasing the reality content of macro-cosmic phenomena. Harold Jacobson and David Singer of the political science department here may be using this. Some schools utilize a model U.N. but most are pretty ineffective. In doing such a model, or in modeling a bargaining situation, it works best with individuals taking the role of decision makers and negotiators, and acting as they might act. An important corrolary is to have available skill resource people who will reflect back to these actors how well they stayed in those roles and how appropriate their behaviors were.

A second method is field work, whereby students go out and actually experience or record other peoples experiences in community political processes. For instance, students could go out and get community reaction to controversial topics. Marich reported that he had his students do some interviewing in the community. Furthermore, on Election Day his students worked in the local precincts. One of the results is not only that they learn about politics, but many have changed some of their attitudes about politics.

A third approach is the case study of method, whereby one takes a write-up of an event or phenomena and inquires as to what that tells us about political principles. For instance, Jennings suggested we take the Little Rock Story and study it to find out about federal and state relations, education, separation of power, civil rights, and the like. One can, in fact, build a course surrounding a series of case studies rather than the usual traditional text book methods.

A fourth major method could be to bring informants who can be interviewed in class and who are experienced resource people in certain areas.

A fifth method is to work directly with the student government council in teaching them social science. Marich reported that Don Weaver at the Kalamazoo lab school had a social science class made up of only those students who had been just elected to the student government council. The general idea of this class is to train these student council leaders to be more effective in their roles.

Another alternative closely connected here would be to explore the feelings of some of the students in the school about student government elections, roles, and policies. Perhaps the Kalamazoo students have some reactions to this elite class of social scientists.

A sixth method is utilizing already prepared resource materials and texts. Marich felt strongly that contemporary texts that are available are really pretty inadequate.

Lippitt raised the question of the possibility of integrating some of the subject matter from history into our discussion of political science. One suggested way of doing this was in our prior discussion of the processes of development and rates of change of institutions. This might get us into looking at some historical data and processes. A second suggestion for doing this was to extend our earlier discussion of comparative work by not only doing cross culture comparatives in the present, but also doing cross temporal comparatives.

This could be accomplished by looking at a certain institution or a certain fundamental process now and how it was accomplished or established in this country one hundred or two hundred years ago. The teacher might also focus on how other countries of different developmental stages are handling certain of these same processes now. Converse suggested a focus on a political science principle, such as the size of governmental units, and a review of the way that they change according to time and space limitations. This might get us into looking at the historical impact of transportation and communication upon the size of governmental units. Now, for instance, New York is closer to Los Angeles than it was to Philedelphia two hundred years ago. Developments in the transportation and communication have made certain kinds of political organizations change and be able, in fact, to grow larger. There is presently a new movement within history itself to look at quantitative and behavioral science methodologies. Converse suggested that Lee Benson will be here this summer for an SRC seminar. Benson is a leader in a new movement among historians and might be interested in spending some time talking with us. In general, the strategic importance of history is relevant to us because history currently holds a balance of power in the organization and teaching of social science and social studies courses. If we are to be able, in any realistic way, to gain entre to school systems for curricula re-organization, we must be able to deal with the entrenchments of historical interest in the curricula.

Converse suggested that many new tools and methods are being utilized in political science now. One of these new tools is mathematical models and computer systems. These will provide in the years to come some very exciting new areas of knowledge. A second major tool and frontier area are the new systems of information and storage and retrieval, which will permit us to retrieve data much more quickly. A third major area that Jennings suggested was comparative and longitudual approaches to the study of change over time and space. A fourth major new area is that of political socialization by which we mean the training of young people in cognitive views of political process, in values about political ends, and in skills in applying and working political with activities. A fifth major area is systems theory and the relationship between macro-cosmic social and political processes. A sixth major area is research on the aggregation of interests, and the joining of individual people into social collectivities. Relevant here are the kinds of coalition formation and resource consolidations that occur as a side effect of this process of aggregating individual efforts.

Several studies are now being done in the area of community decision making and community power structures that are relevant to this new development. Closely related to this is a seventh area of increasing research on the centralization of power and the meaning of centralization and federalization of power for independent sectors of the policy and the economy. An eighth major new area is that of the behavioral and quantitative study of alienation, and some reflection upon its functions and dysfunctions in social life. Converse suggested that most of the areas we talked about are not so much new areas as old areas that are being re-studied with new tools and new methods.

SESSION 10

ECONOMIC I

The consultants, Professors Herrick and Morgan, were informed at the beginning that our team's concentration was on the micro-social sciences, but that we wanted to have some experience with the more macrologic disciplines. Morgan responded by noting that economics was both a micro and a macro science. He personally was more interested in the micro aspects of economics, particularly pertaining to behavioral economics and consumer economics. Macroeconomics, according to Morgan, is mostly concerned with large scale national issues such as wage policy, price policy, and time series analyses of economic and industrial growth. This broad conceptual pattern of looking at the industrial and economic picture, he feels, is well handled and a great many economists are paying attention to it. This is one of the reasons why he is more interested in micro and consumer aspects of economics. Micro economics involves subjects that are just as conceptually complicated as macro economics, but in addition they run into important vested interests and a large number of popular American myths.

What are some of the concepts, rules or organizing principles of micro economics? Morgan suggested that we start with the concept of opportunity costs; which states that the real economic cost of an item or a policy is the next best thing that you give up in order to get this one. At the macro level accessing opportunities costs would be a decision, for instance, between guns and butter. At the micro level it might be a decision between a car and a long vacation. The cost of doing something is the cost of not doing another thing. All the issues of time installment buying and time discount are relevant and important in micro or consumer economics. Morgan explained the rule of 72, which said that in order to understand how long it takes for a thing to double you divide the percent increase into 72. For instance, if an investment doubles in 18 years it means you're making four per cent interest. Ten per cent interest means your original investment would double in a little over seven years. This rule is not only applicable to money investment but also to something like population growth. The population is growing at three per cent a year; it will double in approximately twenty four years. Another procedure in learning consumer economics would be to look at the means for maximizing household satisfaction.

Some other kinds of issues might be income distribution, the way income is spent, taxes, insurance, interest and interest rates, housing and mortgage, credit, investments, governmental activity, family budgeting and finance, health and medical costs. Samuelson was suggested as a major reference work, which is, however, stronger on macro than on micro areas.

Herrick reported the findings of a survey he is involved in, suggesting that very few schools now require a course in economics at the senior high level but that close to eighty per cent of the schools are considering requiring such a course. Herrick noted his concern that there are few appropriate materials available for high school students and that there are relatively few teachers who are prepared to teach economics. Certainly neither of these exist in sufficient quantities should these eighty per cent of the school systems decide that they are going to require a course. Rand McNally has just published a book appropriate for ninth graders, Economics for American Living. The twin issues in preparing high school students seem to be teaching material in a way that is accurate, and teaching it so that it is really covered. The conceptual difficulties involved in these materials make it hard for it to be taught soundly, and the vested interests and normative issues involved make it difficult to deal with sensitive issues reasonably, fairly and openly. As an example, it should be pointed out that not only are there two dozen forms of life insurance, but as each year goes by a man needs less life insurance. The second statement is much blunter than the first, much more sensitive than the first, but just as true.

The kind of material Morgan and Herrick have been talking about is relevant for the pre-college student, but perhaps even more relevant for the drop-out who will more quickly move into those areas of life where this kind of knowledge is necessary and useful. There are a number of exercises that could be built to aid the teaching of consumer economics. Critical incidents could be developed that would utilize a student's own experience, own spending patterns, and financial resources. In Ann Arbor driver education courses, the students are asked to sit down and figure out the average daily cost of owning a car. The buying price, insurance, gas, oil, repairs, and depreciation on a car, for instance, all add up to the cost of owning a car. As these materials are taught in high school they ought to be related to geography and history and civics courses. One exercise that Morgan developed for his students was to ask them to go out to a used car salesman and inquire about the price of a car.

Students typically find that after they hem and haw for a couple of minutes the salesman discovers an algebraic mistake in his figuring and reduces the price of the car by a hundred dollars. The first time this happens the students are surprised but by the third or fourth time they begin to understand something about the workings of the market system. As another example, Herrick suggested informing students how the school budget is determined and how some of the services they have or do not have are mediated by school milage elections, property taxes and political events. Moreover, it is clear that they can, if they want to, influence the course of these events. From Herrick's point of view this material should be integrated with other materials throughout the entire grade range. He suggested taking an era, an event or an issue and looking at it with all the knowledge the participants can offer. For instance American history has its economic, as well as historical, political, and sociological aspects. Health, currently has its economic, as well as medical, biological, sociological and psychological aspects. One of the problems Herrick noted was that teachers are allowed to teach economics with minimal collegiate training in that field. Given such problems in the certification for economics, most teachers don't get much training in economics, but they're consistently teaching it under the guise of other courses, This consistently creates a problem in adequate preparation and instruction.

One of the key issues that Morgan thought was important to explain, with plenty of examples, was national fiscal policy. This is a hot issue, a controversial one and a real one. National fiscal policy is a crucial issue that all citizens ought to understand in order to make personal and public decisions appropriately. Starting in this area of macro economics is conceptually very important for students to understand, and is exciting and could be related immediately to things that are going on. These phenomena affect individual and consumer economic decisions, such as can they afford a house, can they afford to get married, and how do they plan their budget? It also determines what kind of risks they can take with regard to investments, automobile insurance, life insurance policy and medical risks. The whole area of risks and protections from risks is another important one to investigate.

Balance of payments and discussions of gold policy are examples of macro policy issues that are important to deal with. Income rate and distribution, budget planning and opportunity cost issues and risk issues are three major problems to deal with. The entire problem of economic equity and distribution of economic resources can also be considered. Examination, for instance, of the distribution of federal welfare funds between a place like Ann Arbor and a place like Central City Detroit or areas in Mississippi might be investigated with a view towards understanding the range and distribution of economic resources in the nation. It may also help explain why property taxes and school taxes are higher in Ann Arbor than in other places, and why in some places a state pays a larger portion of the school budget.

Morgan suggested a procedure whereby we might use and review the Samuelson elementary text book. Starting from the basic principles and concepts he discusses we could design field experiences and experiments that students can conduct. Using these experiences might help them to understand Samuelson's concepts. Morgan illustrated this by suggesting that from Samuelson's basic notion of opportunity cost we can derive ways of allocating resources in order to gain maximum utilization of the kinds of resources one has. Using this reasoning a student can understand that one of the major costs in owning a house is the amount of money you are not making on investments, if you could put your money into investments rather than a house. Morgan also suggested we take a look at what he calls the fallacy of composition. At the macro level, the fallacy of composition is illustrated by the fact that if everyone saves more money, the economy will collapse. What is good for one person is not necessarily good for everyone, because everyone ends up bankrupt. Further, Morgan mentioned time-discounting, which illustrates that things are not necessarily worth the same amount at different points of time. Control of resources is important to people because they can sometimes add to or multiply their resources. If you are willing to give up control of your own resources for some period of time, you can get interest on those resources and increase them.

Harrick mentioned the problem of deciding at what age levels different economic concepts and principles can be effectively taught to young children. Herrick suggested the following list of major problem areas, within each area of which one could choose a number of concepts to deal with substantively, specifically, and experimentally: scarcity; economic systems -- such as communism, socialism, capitalism; utilization of resources, growth and stability; banking and monetary systems, economics of under developed areas. These six are currently getting a lot of attention but he suggested some others that are not getting so much attention in the high schools nowadays: business and industry; the role of government; international trade; markets; national income; labor and wages;

agriculture; economic security; and personal finance. Most of the concepts on this list are macro areas of concern. In order to deal importantly and effectively with the basically temporal relevance of some of these issues, Morgan suggested that we need to emphasize the basic theoretic problems underlying them and to stress the ability of the student to analyze contemporary events in terms of these basic theoretical systems.

Herrick and Morgan specified a five stage sequence of acts in the analytic process. The first stage is to identify a problem; the second stage is to investigate it, to read material, make an experiment, gather data, gain experience. The third step is to share data and to analyze it; the fourth step is to write alternative causes and solutions along with criteria and the fifth stage is to apply these causative notions or solutions to the individual problem and test out analytical abilities. An important step in this process, of course, is identifying the criteria by which you select an appropriate and relevant problem. In other words, these consultants are suggesting that we identify some major theoretical concepts and develop these concepts through this problem solving process into young people's understandings of economic curriculum and events.

Five steps that Herrick is going through in the development of his organization is first; the establishing the most important content; second, making priorities amongst this content; third, connecting these priorities with the current curriculum; fourth, embarking upon a program of teacher education; and fifth, preparing appropriate material and references for teachers and students to use. Morgan suggested that in teacher education we may not have to think about making all teachers competent in economics, but may settle for teaching teachers how to teach certain selected concepts. There is a wide difference between teaching teachers how to handle certain areas effectively and training them to be economists. The latter may be an unrealistic desire for us. Herrick described some teacher training institutes he had held which lasted anywhere from several days to several weeks. Large clusters of these concepts are dealt with in some detail, as well as teaching methodology relevant for these concepts. Another important concern here is the ideological bias or controversial bias in many of these economic areas. Herrick attempts to solve this problem by having people from many different kinds of institutions, representing different policy positions present the material around each concept. This does not, however, answer the question of what the teacher does with it when he gets into the classroom.

Courses in budgeting or family economics are usually not taught in college and certainly not taught in high school. Herrick reported that most people he talks with in his attempt to spread the teaching of economic courses in high schools suggest that the legitimate kinds of economics that needs to be taught is macro economics (for this he uses Heilbroner's new book). At the same time people say that individuals pick up micro economics, and therefore, there is no need to teach it to them. Herrick's own position is that people don't pick it up, and people walk around with a great deal of mis-information and misunderstanding about such things as financing, insurance, mortgaging, etc. In many ways both Morgan and Herrick are suggesting that consumer economics or micro economics are generally not considered legitimate by economists and academicians. There is a great need in this area for new kinds of materials that are technically and conceptually correct and still reasoned and well balanced in their presentation. Morgan cited one example of high school teaching of consumer economics where the professor sent the students out into the field to sample the prices of a number of staple goods, over a several week period students discovered that the price of bacon varied twenty cents. The teacher used this price range in bacon to teach the students something about the laws of supply and demand, and the ways in which the stores offer inducements to housewives to shop at certain times of the month for certain products. Herrick noted that he is currently publicizing for the first three grades materials that Senesh has done for SRA, and for the fourth and fifth grades materials from Chicago's Industrial Relation Center. There are also a number of audio-visual aids. Some of the problems in teacher preparation and teacher preparation deficiency can be dealt with by utilizing team teaching patterns and teacher exchanges.

SESSION 11

ECONOMIC II

Professors Fusfeld and Boulding acted as consultants. Boulding stated that, at least in the lower grades, economics should be integrated into other subject matter. Fusfeld felt that the starting point was in terms of what the teachers were presently capable of doing rather than re-educating them. He stated that this would mean that economics could be brought into such areas as American history, modern history, by looking at comparisons of different systems, and a study of contemporary economic problems such as currently are part of civics courses. Economics could be brought in on an ad hoc basis when there were opportunities to develop some economic insights.

Fusfeld went on to suggest a second approach to be taken. This would be an approach of looking at the basic understandings that a contemporary individual ought to know about. He noted that there are two really basic concepts in economics that are fundamental to all the others. One of these is the concept of equilibrium or the balance of conflicting forces. This involves looking at the relationship of forces and how they are brought into some kind of balance. Demand and supply on the market leading to a price is an example. The second concept is concept of growth and change. This involves looking at the forces and conflicts that lead to expansion and change.

In both of these concepts there are institutional factors involved, including what the economist would call market system and this would include the whole complex of consumers, business firms, financial institutions, another factor as a set of attitudes for motivational patterns. Boulding noted that the major hurdle here involves getting from an approach which simply looks at such things as, what mother does when she goes to the store, to a point where there is some understanding of the concepts of the economic system as a whole. Most of the fallacies in economic thinking arise from generalizing from personal experience. One of the most important things to do, at the high school level, would be to get people away from generalizing from personal experience. Personal experience is "a very imperfect sample". Looking at and relating to personal experience is a good place to start from but it should be noted that the problem just mentioned needs to be overcome. Therefore, the goal of education in Economics can be seen as moving the individual away from this small scale personalized experience to an understanding of what the whole complex world is like.

Fusfeld put it in terms of there being a need to develop a theoretical, intellectual understanding. This would involve getting a conceptual framework which could handle a number of phenomena and the relationships. This can be thought of as a construction within which a lot of phenomena can fit. Whatever the procedures used, they must lead to the development of the students' awareness of a scheme of things that relate. The advantage of doing this in a civics or a history course would be that this kind of thing is seen in relationship to the environment. The theoretical scheme all by itself doesn't "catch". One approach to getting across these basic concepts would be that of a cross-cultural exploration. It is possible to analyze attitudes and motivations cross-culturally. This would illustrate the application of these principles to a variety of social sciences.

Boulding noted that the social sciences are coming to be more and more integrated and less and less distinguishable. He noted further that the central differentiating phenomena of economics is that of exchange. This gets you into markets, price systems, money. This also begins to move you beyond economics. Sociology is increasingly looking at informal change. Parsons does this. There is exchange even within the family. This can move into looking at the phenomena of conflict. Conflict theory runs all across the social sciences as does decision making and decision theory. One other phenomena that runs throughout all areas is organization theory. Alfred Kuhn of the University of Cincinnati has a book out that integrates social sciences on the basis of such underlying concepts. One way to explore these concepts introducing a level of sophistication would be to develop a course in applied social mathematics. There is apparently resistance to such an approach amongst the historical orientations toward social science.

Fusfeld felt that economics could be taught in a manner that would appeal to low income groups. He suggested that this would be true around the phenomena of poverty, race relations, or perhaps sex. One could explore the economics, the sociology and the psychology of the race problem for example. Another topic could be problems of urbanization. One could include such things as are discussed in the books of Myrdal or Silverman.

Fusfeld felt that much of the consumer economics taught today is weak and not very useful. He thought there is too much emphasis on this aspect and suggested that the best way for children to learn economics is through practical experience. Boulding agreed that consumer economics is not very well taught but felt that it might be a good starting place through being so intimately involved in peoples' lives. Whether consumer economics or practical experience was used as the jumping off point he suggested that both could center around the family and household so that students could become aware of the social system and yet develop systematic analysis.

Another kind of concept that is important is that of quantitative sense. A sense of what are quantities of a social system. For example, a sense of what is a million acres, or a million dollars, or other quantities. It was noted that Boulding suggested that geography could be made one of the major basis of the social sciences. He felt that this could be very good in the high school, although it currently is not. It could be the whole idea of organizing the social system around a special relationship. One could give a statistical geographical historical background on this. The goal would be to give them some kind of sense of what they (the student) are really sampling.

Fusfeld noted that it seems that, as our society gets more complex technologically and larger in size and scope, and more integrated within itself, the proportion of people who can get on the success path and stay on it is becoming more and more limited. More and more ability, intelligence, and training are needed to be successful. At the same time mechanism that reject from success path are operating with greater effectiveness. We generate rejects from our social system. The schools are one of the organizations by which we evaluate the people and produce this rejection. Sometimes it is a rejection mechanism that operates itself and sometimes it is operated by people. From the point of view of the educational process the schools have a problem to develop training programs for both groups. There is a need to bring the rejectees back into the system. Education to that end needs to be provided. The schools have been very good in training along the success paths, but not very good in re-training or training people back into the success path once they have been rejected. A social science course could be devised for the potential rejects so as to minimize the procedure. It was noted that the definition of success in our society as well as the society itself is changing. This would need be taken into account in developing the social science curriculum and dealing with this problem of rejection. Boulding questioned this and noted, for example, that small businesses are increasing. He noted further that as technology moves more people out of manufacturing, the service industries are increasing. This will mean an increase in the tertiary section of the economy which looks more and more like classical economics. The number of paths to success will increase. He noted that the problem here is the legitimation of these differing paths to success. Boulding felt that our system is going to become more like that of Japan.

The consultants were asked what they would teach to a group of high school aged youth if they had agreed to teach some kind of a unit or course on the social sciences. Boulding's response was as follows. He would have them first write an autobiography and also their own genealogical table for their family. He would then have them look at kinship and the meaning of kinship comparing their genealogical table with a look at the Australian aborigines, the DRA, the Shinto. He would then have them work out their family budgets and look at how income is apportioned. At that point, which would be at the end of perhaps two weeks, he would give his first lecture which would be on allocation in society. It would look at government budget making, the council of economic advisors, the gross national product, the decline of agriculture, the development of the war industry. This would involve value implications. There would need to be a look at how the situation actually is as well as valuative reactions to it. He would stress the fun of finding out "what is". There would also be an evaluative look at, "is this budget a wise one?" They would then get into looking at how government achieves consensus. They would look at meetings and the decision making process. They would perhaps go to watch a city council meeting. The question of how this group makes decisions would be looked at. They would also look at how the principal of their school, a business man, and others make decisions. They would look at what information is and how it affects the decision making. They would look at how it is communicated. There would be a look at conflict and its meaning and usefulness at this process.

Fusfeld felt he would wind up with much the same kind of information by a somewhat different route. He would start out by having a matrix for the teacher to refer to. This matrix could be thought of as containing the subjects that the teacher should cover. Along the top of the matrix would be the basic processes including such things as organizations, motivation, decision making, conflict, exchange, and information. On the other side of the matrix you would have the basic concepts of social sciences. These would include such things as the economic concepts of marketing, equilibrium, economic growth, and various sociological and psychological concepts. Their matrix would then relate all these things systematically. Fusfeld would then start out in the first few days by having the students read the daily newspapers. From this they would decide on a series of events that they found relevant and interesting. They would pick one or two on the basis of having reached the consensus. They would discuss what it is about the topic that interests them and work out questions from their discussion. They would then spend time seeking to find out as much as they possibly could in response to these questions about the topic by going to the libraries. They would come back and discuss one aspect of the topics. They would try to bring out what facts, differences of opinions, view points, and fundamental social processes are involved in this aspect of the topic. They would then raise further questions about these and go through the process of studying to try and bring out more information about these processes and concepts. The teacher would seek to focus on as many as possible of the processes and basic concepts in their matrix in this manner. The teacher's job is to make as many of these processes and concepts as explicit as he possibly can. To sum up then, there are three parts to this approach. The teacher uses the matrix as a check list. There is an immediacy of confrontation material. There is self study and exploration by the youth. A major need in taking this approach is for consultation and resources to be available to the teacher.

SESSION 12

TEACHING AND LEARNING

Professors Erikson and Koen acted as consultants.

Professor Erikson suggested that an important focus of a social science course should be to present some models of man's alternatives to the prevailing models presented by Freudian and other psycho-analytic theories. The Freudian model adopted by Hollywood and the mass media needs to be seen in context as one of several models of man and needs to be contrasted with a learning theory model of development, mental health, neurosis, and the like. Erikson explicitly suggested that formal and traditional learning theories not be a part of this social science course. Formal learning theories might better be included as part of a biology course, or a general science course. Koen agreed with this, suggesting that a social science course should focus on the cognitive aspects of human learning and behavior, especially as opposed to the libido or pleasure seeking aspects of development proposed in the Freudian model. One important implication of this approach is that the variables that determine and condition behavior are considered to be available for analysis. They are not necessarily hidden or completely unconscious; many of them are observable and can be manipulated.

Although traditional learning theory is not an appropriate subject matter for a social science course, Erikson thought that it was important that young people understand something about reinforcement, reinforcement theory, and some basic principles of behavioral analysis. Some time needs to be spent on exploring assumptions about the biological nature of human behavior and human experience. That is, the conditioners of human behavior prior to societal and social psychological influences.

Erikson suggested that a very important topic in teaching social science to young people was the comparison of Darwinian social learning and and evolutionary theories of human growth and development, and Freudian theory. In fact, he suggested he would spend the first fifth of the semester in making this comparison. Koen felt it was important in looking at man's behavior to review the commonalities and differences along the phylo-genetic scale. In addition to the biological commonalities and differences, he would review the change in conditions for optimal learning as we move along the evolutionary scale. For instance, reinforcement and the empirical law of effect are concepts that are common to learning all along the phylo-genetic scale. On the other hand, one of the things that distinguishes man from the rest of the phylo-genetic is language. Therefore, it makes good sense to look at those learning procedures and conditions that are particularly fruitful in aiding language learning. One could look, for instance, at the different means of communication in bees, ants, birds, dogs, fish and man. The languages or communication systems that animals use are innate, whereas, the communication systems and languages that man uses are learned. This important distinction helps us understand progress along the phylo-genetic scale. One of the useful issues in looking at language and language learning in the high schools is that, as Cohen suggests, young people are inherently interested in and curious about language. Specific verbal symbols and language may be seen and studied as part of a broader range of communicative acts.

An important and embracing concept that must be dealt with is psychological or behavioral determinism. That is, that behavior is a condition of certain internal and external variables that are operating. This is a priority concept to get across. Erikson emphasized the controversial nature of this principle by suggesting that clear and concise teaching of this principle almost necessitates religious and parental confrontation of the teacher.

Erikson noted that to teach social science as opposed to social philosophy or social studies the student needs a good firm behavioral base. He would make sure that students know how to use concepts such as reinforcement, association, contiguity, and response frequency. With these kinds of concepts firmly in their minds they would be able to practice the rational-experimental process of behavioral sciences. Students should be able to move above operationalization. Koen felt it was important in this context to stress the idea that psychology is a science and not merely a philosophical approach to human experience.

One suggestion for organizing a course was made by Erikson. He reflected upon a senior honors course in psychology he taught at Vanderbilt. The course started with seniors stating the ten criteria they would establish for personal success in life. After establishing these criteria they were asked to think about what psychology had to offer and what light psychology could shed on any of these criteria. Another related suggestion he made was for students to think about ten great ideas psychology had that were important to them. Each week they took one of these ideas and talked about its meaning for them and its relevance for the kinds of criteria they had established for their life. As an illustration he suggested a concept such as the standard error of measurement, which when discussed at the last part of the semester put the issues of personal humility and relative uncertainty of the future into bold relief. Erikson's experience in this course is reported in the American Psychologist somewhere between 1955 and 1960.

Erikson further suggested that our consultation procedure in the future focus not on what should be taught, but on what kinds of behavioral outcomes we should look for in high school students who have been exposed to courses in the social sciences. How should the high school student who has taken this course behave differently from other high school students? This matter of specification of our behavioral objectives could then be operationalized into specific content and methodology. For example, Erikson said that he himself thought it crucial that high school students and graduates understand something about prejudice and the dynamics of prejudice; that they understand something about mental health concepts and its development; that they understand something about group behavior and the development of group norms. People who are going to live as members of groups, who are going to be influenced by groups, and who in turn are going to exert influence on groups need to understand something about the internal dynamics and the external relationships between organized chaos and cosmos.

Marich inquired as to whether the goals and behavioral outcomes of a course would be decided upon in advance by the instructor and consultants or whether they could in part be derived from group inquiry in the classroom. Erikson responded that a lot of the work in group inquiry and group process is an inefficient use of classroom time. Some of it, of course, is useful in developing group standards and attitudes in the classroom. Koen suggested that one of the ways to deal with students' resistance to talking about and examining prejudice is to look at it dispassionately and to view the phenomenon of prejudice without making evaluations. An inquiry into the circumstances under which people learn prejudice may be most interesting to high school seniors. Such procedure dramatizes the difference between a psychologist and a minister or teacher who is trying to make a good citizen. The psychologist is not trying to make a good citizen; he is interested in studying the phenomenon. This is Koen's major theme: that we can pick up any concept or phenomenon and ask ourselves this question: What are the variables that produce or influence this phenomenon?

Erikson noted that there was so much to do in terms of introducing new social science curriculum, that he would prefer to squeeze history almost completely out of the cirriculum right now. An alternative may be to change the way history is handled and look at some of the psychological variables involved in historical events and some of the psychological and historical views of contemporary personal and social phenomena. One fruitful approach to history that Koen suggested was to look at the cultural traits and ethos of a nation and a people. In this procedure we can manage the wedding of social science or psychology and history.

Koen summarized much of his concern with learning and verbal learning as a focus for the course by noting that everything humans do is learned. Therefore, to study human behavior it is fruitful to look at those conditions which optimize learning. Koen suggested that we should speak of historical events in psychological terminology and use a psychological level of analysis. For instance, take the disturbance in Little Rock, Arkansas, one may see it as the rebellion of a political sub-unit against the expressed will of the larger unit.

New Frontiers

A major new frontier for Koen is the area of psycholinguistics. This is the area in which he himself is doing research, and he is interested in the way in which people use language and the different kinds of things language means to different groups of individuals. He is currently interested in the interaction between language and all other forms of human behavior. Erikson stated that his major concern would be imagining the state of things twenty years from now. The state of race relations as a major problem in this country, our international relations, social class relationships, problems of poverty, and in general our relations with people of lower social status within the nation, are all major areas of social science inquiry that must be explored.

SESSION 13

THE SCHOOL: A SOCIAL SETTING

Our consultants for today's session are Professors Angell and Withey.

Angell started our session by saying that he had looked at the table of contents of an Introductory Sociology text and tried to decide what kinds of things among this list a high school person should know. He had eight suggestions. (1) The student should understand that an institution, and in particular the school as an institution, is part of a larger cultural field. The curriculum he takes, the manner of course organization, and the values embodied in the courses are part of the American context. Therefore, the curriculum should fit the child's ability and yet train him to look for certain social goals and needs. One of the ways of highlighting this conceptual problem may be to look comparatively at schools in different cultures or sub-cultures. (2) The student should be acquainted with the process of socialization and training for the adult community. What is the role of the school in the socialization process? And how does the school collaborate with other institutions, primary groups, family, and the economy in the socialization process? (3) The student should see types of differentiation especially between people. In the school one can see this in terms of regional, social class, age, intelligence, and academic and occupational differences. One can also look at the individual differences among pupils in the class as well as at these social categories. (4) He should be acquainted with the issues of life in an urban technological society. We are no longer a rural, agricultural, simple society in most parts of the country and students need some acquaintance with the major issues and problems of the urban, technical society. The adolescent issues of anomie, school drop-outs, delinquency, and complexity in modern life are all related to this. (5) Students should be helped to understand the issues of bureaucracies, a highly organized form in contemporary society. The school can be taken as one example of a bureaucracy with its unique role of differentiation and of role expectations. Teacher-pupil relationships can be viewed as one example of mutual and reciprocal role relations and expectations. Students expect the teacher to behave in certain ways and the teacher expects the student to behave in certain ways. To the degree that the mutuality of their behaviors are congruent with their expectations they will be able to deal with one another more smoothly. (6)

Another topic would be to look at the purpose of schools, education and vocations. Angell noted that most of his students see the purpose of schooling, even college schooling, in psychological terms. They see the purpose as helping them to get along, or grow, or to make a good life. An important issue, he thought, was to help them to see the role of school as educating in a sociological sense. The purpose of schooling is to train the students to perform certain roles in the society and to fulfill certain needed skills and abilities. (7) Students should examine the whole area of citizenship, government and political responsibility to help them understand some of their political roles as mature adults. (8) Students should read and understand the excellent book by Coleman on the Adolescent Society, Angell suggested that students study this book, become familiar with it and try to figure out where they fit in the kind of high school and society that Coleman describes.

Withey felt it was difficult to deal directly with the vague nature of our original question, i.e., What would you teach? He felt that it was important to settle upon some frame of reference from which to approach social science. There are essentially five basic models which may serve as reference points for the social sciences, mathematical, physical, biological, ecological, and cultural. Withey suggested that one could start with the physical model, which is the simplist, and then move through psychology to the social sciences. However, he thinks for the present discussion the ecological beginning point is the best. One can look at certain elements of topological ecology, such as deserts, mountains and geographic differences and move towards elements of social ecology. To see social relationships as problems in ecology might mean asking such questions as: Is it easier to learn when you're all of the same age or a different age? What difference would it make whether your teacher is old or young? What difference does it make if you spent six or twelve years in school? What difference would it make if your family was twice as big as it is now or if the school were twice as big. Giving social concepts an ecological context may help us identify some of the relationships between variables and some of the differences that different forms of organizations make. The ecological viewpoint easily leads into understanding the cultural position and problems of differentiation. Angell wondered whether the ecological example of how would life be different if you had two fathers might not be too abstract for children to deal with. He also wanted to know how the ecological approach was relevant to and led to culture. Withey suggested that the purpose of the ecological approach was to understand behavior by understanding the world that a person lives in. Without knowing anything about a person's age or sex what can we say about him, if all we know is that he lives in the desert? There are things that we can say about him from just that knowledge of his ecological environment. Now, if we added some more facts about the ecological surroundings we might know more things about that person. In this kind of exercise we're demonstrating influence of the environment upon the person. We will also want to reverse this and look at some instances where the person influences the environment and finally move to looking at the interaction between the two - which is after all the focus of the social sciences. We talk about moving then from the climate to the culture, to the stored meanings which is the cultural heritage, to the way those meanings influence information handling, and ultimately to the receiving of values and rewards.

Lippitt raised the question of whether the learner is primarily in a passive role in this process and Angell suggested that it did not have to be that way. A student could investigate these concepts as they apply to his school and immediate community.

Both Withey and Angell suggested that students inquiries start somewhere other than commonplace events in their lives. Angell suggested that they are interested in things like heroes and other things in the macrological society beyond themselves. Therefore, we ought to start with something at the national level and not with the self and immediate families. Withey noted that social studies teachers would not be comfortable in this. Nimroff agreed and stated that they would want to know the "fact content" of this. Since Withey suggested that this procedure was very different from what's going on it would be hard for teachers to follow the kinds of leads he has suggested. Angell suggested that in the future more movies would be available as resource documentaries to social science questions.

Angell raised the question of whether or not there should be more disciplinary and more systematic courses in social sciences in the high school. In the junior high there is a great deal of marking time and its quite possible that more material could be pushed into that area. Therefore, students could get to the disciplinary and systematic courses earlier. At the same time people say that anything of a systematic social science nature in high school is a mistake, and that some non-systematic work on life experience problems is needed. There is no resolution to this question except that we did want to separate the problem of systematic and non-systematic from the problem of disciplinary and inter-disciplinary. Angell raised another concern regarding the possibility that students will get and remember generalizations about phenomena without all the qualifications that attend to any scientific precept or generalization. He is afraid they would readily accept any causal explanation of events without paying attention to the specific conditions under which an event or phenomenon occurs. He said that he would not therefore, not teach social science, but would be wary not to slip into this distortion via either too global or too sophisticated a series of presentations.

We now turned our attention to the possibilities that might exist for using the school as a simple institution or laboratory in which to learn social science. Withey suggested that we might take the Sheriff experiments and re-create them in the classroom. The class might be split up into several groups competing with one another and then finally working together for a common goal. The teacher or researcher could collect data on this experience. A second major possibility is the socialization process itself. One grade, for instance, the fifth or sixth might go and look at the kindergarten and see the size of the play group, or the cross-sex interchanges, and in the process they might learn systematic observation skills. The really crucial step here is that they be instructed in what kinds of things to look for so their observations can be systematic. A third example is role playing that can be used in many ways to collect data, to reproduce situations, to show feelings, to examine some findings and to test out some interpretations of events. A fourth focus might be the student government council itself as a medium for learning about government, political responsibility and power relationships.

Angell wondered whether it was really possible to teach an understanding of the cultural scene to high school students. For instance, how does the student get to understand the cultural meanings and experiences that almost unconsciously intrude upon him and which he eventually internatizes? How does the child realize the impact of continual exposure to certain kinds of norms and experiences? It is almost a question of "what has influenced my development?" It is very hard for students to deal with this question unless they can meet other people around them who have been influenced in different ways. It is difficult to find and observe cultural diversity in a school that maximizes cultural homogeneity. We may see internal variation within a class by getting at class norms and individual differences, but the people within a class are still externally similar with regard to out of school influences and experiences. Nimroff suggested the possibility that high school students might study the different kinds of courses that people take and relate them to the feeder school and elementary schools or junior high schools that students came from. The crucial issue here is that the basis of comparisons should not be priviledge or evaluation, but the different kinds of things that people learn. For instance, Withey mentioned his experience in an introductory psychology class where three different IQ tests were given. One was a general Stanford-Binet verbal test, the second a farm phenomenon test (where a tree is described as a part of a wagon to be correct), and the third, is a delinquent argot kind of a test. Students who score high on one of these intelligent tests did not score high on the others. This points out the cultural relativeity of a thing such as intelligence. (Another example of the demonstrated verbal competence of lower class children is the task of "signifying", whereby they use different words, slang terms and epitaphs to describe their mothers. The child who cries first or starts to fight first is the loser. The colloquial name for this game of signifying is "mommy rapping". Angell suggested a type of game that is played in Sicilian communities in Southern Italy, described in a book called The Law. The question is what kinds of things do people from different cultures learn, how are these different kinds of things functional to them, and how do they compare to the kinds of things that other people learn. Lippitt suggested another possibility for teaching cultural relativity and differences, where children might read a book such as Six Cultures, and then take a classroom or family situation and try to examine which child from which culture might best be able to handle this particular social function. What this does is help us look at the different kinds of life experiences between cultures that are functional, rather than trying to evaluate characteristics on a single un-dimensional scale of preference. Another way of fruitfully studying cultural variation in the high school is language. We can take simple words and understand how they feel to us. Withey suggested the word soft. We can think about how it feels to say the word. We can also take some Whorfian examples, such as the fact that eskimos do not have a word for snow, because they have fifty words to describe different kinds of snow. A carpenter will seldom use the word hammer, because he knows there are so many different kinds of hammers he has to be so much more specific in his language. In addition to looking at the frequency and meaning of words, we can also look at the way some people react to language and in this case the "mommy rapping" example cited earlier may be helpful.

In the school the principle role of the child is that of learner. One can focus then on how do we learn these roles in the school. Not only what are internal predispositions that help us fulfill that role effectively, but what are the ecological sanctions and variables incumbent upon that role? What is the text book organization, curricular determination and teacher posture that help establish a certain kind of role as learner? The problem here is that while logically and formally the principle role the children learn in school is that of the learner, it is also true they learn some other ideas. For instance, students learn quiet, dependent and powerless passive roles. It is not at all clear that learning how to learn is the major task for young people in the schools. However, this could certainly be looked at in an interesting manner.

Another prominent sociological phenomena we can look at in the classroom is that of the function and inter-dependence of roles. We can look at different student and student-teacher roles. With a common task we can see how the students divide up the tasks to be accomplished in order to do it most effectively in a functional manner. The division of labor and roles, might be another example.

In Ann Arbor, there currently seems to be antagonism and mutual disrespect between certain of the junior high schools. This is certainly something that can be studied and dealt with from a social science point of view; and it might be very interesting for high school students to explore. In addition, students may learn some skills in scientific methodology and problem-solving. They could do a survey of all the different junior high schools that fed into a given high school and review the students different expectations as well as their mutual perceptions of one another.

New Frontiers

Withey suggested that the future of the social scientist will be largely looking at organization as a process; not organization as an institution, but as a process of bringing people together. Phenomena such as interaction, interdependence and mutual growth will be gaining a lot of attention in social science in the next decade or two. Any secondary school course which we promote ought to be heavily weighed in this direction. To follow this a little further, we could look at some classroom phenomena and see how the teacher organizes work and time or how the students organize teams. In the process of organizing teams, they must select members, allocate responsibility, define a task, and define their needs. As a result of this they need to look into the issues around independence of roles and the relationship of their roles to certain kinds of social institutions. In the process they must construct organizations within themselves to do certain kinds of tasks. Angell suggested a recent article by Landecker was relevant to this. Too much of a concentration, however, on the process of organization may, according to Angell, involve people in such minutia as to prevent them from seeing the forest of large issues beyond the trees. For instance, how does the school fit into the larger society? How does the organization process that is being managed right now fit into other processes or other institutions in the society? It may be very hard to understand these macro issues working up and outward from the inside.

The second major frontier that Angell himself, is working on is that of conflict and cooperation between groups at the macrological level. Not between individuals, but in the Sheriff and Coleman sense of looking at these phenomena between groups in the society. Angell is particularly interested in this at the national and international levels.

Another major concept that represents a frontier is that of social cross-cutting, whereby, people who have membership in a variety of groups with over-lapping membership tend to be more integrated with one another. This is close of Likert's concept of overlapping linkages of supervisory roles in organizations. On the international level Angell is suggesting that common economic development and water conservation projects among different nations in the Balkans might aid in cross-cutting some of the Western and Eastern block formations.

Angell and Withey raised another question of whether all children should learn the same things, particularly if their goals, styles, and courses through life are and will be different. One of the questions was whether it might be dangerous to bring up this kind of discussion in class because it might make some lower class students particularly vulnerable. Lippitt reported on some research that suggested this is already common knowledge and the children already feel and know where they are going to end up. In fact, it is our collusion to maintain public ignorance about this that is most dangerous. Therefore, the suggestion is that this is something that might be talked about in class and that children who have different goals might publicly discuss the different kinds of learnings that are relevant for them. In this regard they might start to structure their own curricular needs and demand different things from the classroom.

Angell requested that we think about the different kinds of experiments that might be created in class to induce experimentally anomie in students. The hope is that they can see in the classroom some of its destructiveness and some of the positive potential it carries for social creativity.

As a final note Angell wanted to mention that much education goes on outside of the schools and that to focus on just the schools as the only education institution of the nation is an error. Therefore, one of the things we might do is not only look at the different kinds of things different children learn, but the different places from which they learn these lessons.

SESSION 14

THE FAMILY

The subject for this session was the Family, and our consultants were Professors Blood and Marquis.

It was suggested that the age of the students should influence the content selected for a curriculum. Major areas of content that would be important would be sex information and preparation for sibling relationships. Pre-puberty information would be important for the later elementary grades. This might best be done by having the boys and the girls together in the course. It probably would also be best to have the course take place in a normal classroom setting. It would be important for there to be ample opportunity for questions and discussion. At the junior high level, it was suggested, the content should broaden out to have a main concern with social rather than biological factors. There might be a seventh grade unit on dating with both boys and girls in the class. One would want to provide an apportunity for the students to discuss the material and personal problems. It is expected that these might include fear and a sense of inferiority relative to the opposite sex, etiquette, what to do in different situations, degree of intimacy, and the relationship of emotional factors to biological factors. The junior high period was seen as crucial in the social area since it is at this time that the first dating and school parties take place. One might consider this a "teachable moment" in relation to the beginning of heterosexual relationships.

The type of content considered so far raises the question of a climate so that discussion can take place in the classroom. It might be best to have this class take place with both the parents and their children learning together. This would provide for discussion between parents and children. A major goal at this point would seem to be that of opening up the communication between generations. This lack of communication was seen as especially prevalent and important during adolescence. Such things as bedtime and allowance could be a starting point leading to more important factors. The PTA might be the best vehicle for setting up this kind of course. Concepts and theories regarding shifts from dependency in the family to mutual respect and exchange which yield some perspective on the process of alteration or change might be good. One reason suggested for the importance of parental involvement was that in many children who reach this age, parents experience a reawakening of Oedipal concerns and incestual impulses. A joint parent-child course can start with the baby and then look at processes of physical and psychological development.

The question of who might teach such a course was considered to be important and it was suggested that persons trained in counselling in the school setting might be good; or else a specially trained teacher who was aware of his or her own motivations might handle it. It was considered that such a family course is especially important for terminal students, who are most likely to have problems and an immediate need for this information.

The training of the teacher was discussed a little more. It was noted that training would be needed in relating with both the children and the parents. It was seen as important that what was being taught had immediate relevance for the pupils. It was suggested that the pupils could observe their own setting such as at home and in the school, to bring in examples of what was being discussed. It was also suggested that they could be given some training in observation and systematic data collection.

A curriculum at the senior high level could best focus on family living, but it should be redefined as a terminal course rather than one primarily for pupils going on to college. This could well follow the earlier personality development course. The family course could be set up to look at parent-child relationships and preparation for marriage. It could include questions of selecting a marriage partner and look at social science research findings relative to this. It could examine the combinations of characteristics that yield a more stable relationship and such factors as interracial marriage, interreligious marriage, research, etc. The children could read some scientific studies. Also material on the development of a two-person relationship to the point of readiness for marriage, should be looked at. In other words, the process of getting to know each other in preparation for marriage would be important. The problem of pre-marital intercourse should get full treatment here. It was suggested that, although it is currently contrary to Michigan law, contraceptive information should be included in such a course as soon as it was allowable. Finally, husband and wife relationships should be looked at. This should include such things as problem solving, conflict resolution, readiness for parenthood, family planning, and then finally parent-child relationships. Definitions and dynamics such as those of Freud should be presented illustratively. Cross-class family phenomena should also be presented.

The specific content along these lines might well vary to suit the population of the school. The priority purpose of such a course would be that of understanding one's own family constellation.

Another important area of content would be that of exploring the repercussions on family life of social change. Such things as redundancy based on economic considerations, shift work, and others should be explored. Other things that should be included would be relations within the nucleated family, relatives, friends, work associates, and social mobility. Another area of content would be the relation of individuals with external resources such as professional advisory services and social institutions. Some of these are important for ego support and some for such things as recreation. They should also be explored in relation to problems and solving problems such as divorce.

Areas of current interest to the two consultants included the current advances in group therapy and work with people on an out-patient basis. This included particularly current exploration and work with family therapy and conjoint therapy. Another area of interest was that of the cross-cultural approach to understanding family life. So far most research in this area has simply been descriptive. There is a need and an exciting potential in taking a more systematic, comparative approach.

SESSION 15

SOCIOLOGY

The kinds of goals applicable to a sociology curriculum were discussed first by our consultants, Professors Mayhew and Olson. It was felt these goals should be value relevant. The course should not simply be pre-professional training but should also be relevant "to human beings facing problems". One should avoid value indoctrination through the dry teaching of concepts, principles, and terms. There should be some emphasis on the methods of social science like sampling technique versus opinion. Experience could be provided by looking at elections and television ratings for example, or by teaching the methodology as a unit. Value differences such as communitarian versus non-communitarian orientations should be brought out. The book, City and History, was cited as a reference here.

The first part of the course should start out with the focus on methodology and should have two parts to it. The first would be to gain a sense of methodology objectives versus opinions. The second part would bring out the sense in which social science is related to values. There should be little concern with simply memorizing definitions of technical jargon of social science. The value relevance brought out in the course should help the student to see the values relevant to their own roles as citizens in our society. This should help them to be able to be more aware of what is going on in current social issues such as Viet Nam. Examples of social issues include world population, growth, nature of underdevelopment, and urbanization as well. Students should also look at such things as what are the major social trends, the major changes in society, to balance the work on personal adjustment.

The teaching technique might use current news as providing content relative to each problem. The development of awareness should be more than incorporating the published orientations. There is a need to provide means for discussing and applying social science principles through exploring social issues. A teacher's manual on principles would probably be important. The teacher would get help on understanding definitions through the manual, whereas the students would get theirs from explorations in the course. It was emphasized that this should not be a text book course; it should be a social science course not a sociology, social psychology, or psychology course. An important goal would be to get away from provincialism. Such phenomena as culture, human plasticity, and the range of human social variation should be brought out. There should be a recognition of pluralism. The United States' way is not "the only", or necessarily the "right", way. There tends to be in our society at the present time a sociological bias. The United States is currently experiencing a freeing from social constraint with little awareness of the social forces which are allowing this freeing phenomenon.

The topics of the plasticity of the man, the notion of social constraint, and culture go together as three sources from which we can look at man. For each there are two levels. One is a symbolic level in which people grow up with different conceptions of what is happening. The other is that people grow up with different amounts of qualitively dissimilar kinds of constraints on them. These restraints make them different. The outcome of learning here that should be made explicit is that of a value tolerance. The book, Growing Up Absurd, was cited as a reference. The author illustrates current criticism against pushing plasticity. Presented is the contrast between the notion that any way can be right versus there are some better ways.

In such a course students should recognize that people operate from different assumptions. You should make clear two aspects of reality including power and legitimacy. This should bring out the fact that there is moral leverage and it needs organization.

The phenomena and concepts of social conflict should be examined. This could be done within the context of race relations, labor management, or others. Another phenomenon that should be looked at is that of social change and modernization and the problems that these raise for society. There would be a goal of creating moral awareness of the social nature of these phenomena, not just the individual actions involved. It is most relevant for students at this time that an international concern should be developed. Working on units in world geography and world population problems students could consider the effects of modernization for the individual countries and how these affect the United States. For example, communism must be fully evaluated and not looked at simply as an evil which is put forth by "the bad guys".

Time spent on microsociology is not relevant to these critical concerns. Microsociology is relevant only to some personal concerns. Macrosociology is more important. The press and television today often fail to distinguish between important and trivial news. It was felt that it was a shame that the old style social studies have been replaced by interpersonal adjustment in the high school curriculum. Any microsociology should be seen as a part of the larger system using the "group dynamics" approach. One should take a broad look at the problem of the emergents. The challenge would be to teach tolerance for ambiguity and committments in the face of ambiguity. Presently, children tend to be protected from confrontation as in Eric Fromm's book, Escape from Freedom.

Discussion now turned to areas of current interest. One is a study of the relation of micro to macro sociology. This would involve discrimination of informal patterns, of primary relations and how they have impact just as do the larger societal forces, of the interaction of primary and secondary groups. How does one implement primary values in the secondary context? There is a theory here and it is needed.

Another current interest is that of the phenomena of modernization. Past emphasis has been on unity and harmony and integration. Now the conflict point of view in looking at problems is important. There is a new style of action research. In the twenties it involved "getting the facts". Now it involves doing action research in a theoretical framework. This is becoming true of sociology as well as group dynamics.

Another interest is the sociology of knowledge. It was noted that positivism is dead. Academic sociologists are being challenged by the "new sociology". This involves the document value bias in research. The sociologist will be a committed actor. The sociologists' role in the face of the explosion of knowledge needs to be looked at. Sociologist will play the role of the intellectual. There is an emergence of comparative research as well as foreign research. We will see a more full blown comparison in social research. There will be more research on pluralism. For example, do independent centers develop in the society versus the convergents within a power center? This will yield research intensification on phenomenon such as poverty. It will yield new theoretical developments like "what we mean by an institution being independent." This is the heyday of political sociology and its ramifications are ascending. Pluralism versus centralism winds up in this context. The classical approach is under attack. The social science fields are converging, see for example the case book method in social problems. It includes testimony before senate committees on pending legislation relevant to social issues.

It was emphasized that the course should not be taught with a standard text. It was added that this would depend on the teacher. The students should be challenged. Teach micro and macro simultaneously by present materials at both levels. Sheriff's work would be a good example of the micro and one could extrapolate from it.

SESSION 16

DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

It was suggested by our consultant, Professor Culter, that the inclusion of material on developmental psychology should not be limited to a review of child development in the traditional sense. An important concept to develop is that individual behavior is determined by historical factors. The history of a person is related to his behavior and must be considered when an evaluation of that behavior is made. In this same line of thinking another important concept needs development: behavior is limited by structure. We ask the question "What is the world like to an amoeba, to a sponge, etc." These organisms are limited by their structure as is man or "superman". One could also get this idea across by looking at a human over a period of time and noting that actions are not the same at all levels of development. Lastly, the inclusion of the concept of learning and motivation are a must.

Experience should be viewed as a process since it involves input, categorization, and output. It follows that one should examine these categories or cognitions and see how they are established. This would be the developmental psychology part of the course. There are a range of approaches. One could look at several of these starting with the Gestalt theory in which these categories are believed to be built in, or the Freudian approach where the psycho-sexual stage is also a system into which categories are built. Moving toward the other end of the continium one could look at Erickson, Fromm, and Piaget. Each have ideas about how the categories are developed. Things that happen as these categories are established determine how one is going to look at the world. It was suggested that Schmuck and Chesler's work present some of the kinds of social factors that should be considered.

It was noted that developmental psychology has an analogy in the development of culture. Out of the social cultural historical context the categories are developed. This idea of categorizing or conceptualizing can be looked at in terms of the individual and in terms of the culture.

An important idea that should be imparted here is that each social science is a part of a whole. There are certain basic concepts of developmental psychology that should be introduced so that they can be looked at in the context of the whole. In taking this approach change should be a phenomenon that is focused upon as it occurs in the individual, in the society, in the culture, etc.

Methodology was discussed. It was felt that individual teachers will vary, and should vary according to their style. Culture favors the socratic procedure. He would use projects to get the students uneasy about "cut and dried" notions" of cause and effect. The need here would be to stimulate the students to inquiry. Chesler suggested cross-age, cross-sex observations, yielding methodological questions. It was suggested that this might lead to areas of concern in terms of the family behavior for example. Therefore, one might start with physical data which is not comparatively threatening. You could eventually work on down to motivational factors which do become more threatening. This raised the whole situation of the dilemma of "non-threat" versus the "legitimizing of scientific inquiry". It was suggested that it might be useful to devise a catalogue of techniques for teachers including helpful hints.

Cutler is currently excited about the conflict resolution work. He also has been doing some work on cognitive and perceptual development in children. This involved looking at the influence of parental attitudes on those of children. For example the body use of children and the parents reaction to the child influences the way he uses his body.

SESSION 17

STRATEGIES AND SUMMATION

Today we have a meeting of only the core group. Present are Chesler, Jung, Marich and myself, Nimroth.

Our purpose this morning is to talk over some of the possible ways that we might use the data that we have collected. Looking at its content, perhaps a scope on sequence is suggested. What should we teach and where in the curriculum should it fit? First of all we began talking about the possibility of our own members working in the classroom. Jung, for example, has teaching credentials and would enjoy teaching an experimental section of the material. This might be an excellent way for us to be right on the spot and see how the students react to the material. It would be more advantageous than to ask teachers to do this and then rely only on their comments.

Nimroth talked a little about the social studies introduction to the social sciences which is used in Palo Alto, California. This is a team-taught situation where they have six members on the team, each one a specialist in a separate field: anthropology, sociology, economics, etc.. As the class deals with the material, a specialist from that particular discipline is in charge and he plans the major elections and presentations, hands out the guide outlines for small group discussions, prepares the examination and so forth. This kind of course is wrapped around a set of major themes.

Chesler has no teaching credential and therefore would be limited in his work in the public schools, but Marich remarked that he could use Chesler at University High School on a consultant basis. We feel that this is probably an excellent avenue for getting Juna and Chesler actually into the classroom. Another strategy might be to get some people from the individual disciplines, such as economic and soicology, to go into the classroom and teach a course or a small segment of a course. The purpose would be to expose the students to the social sciences and at the same time give a master of that discipline an opportunity to see ways of using it in the classroom.

In looking at the current curriculum we find that by and large the seventh grade and the ninth grade are the only two grades in which any kind of exploratory-type materials are currently being used. This is pretty general across the country. In the eighth and eleventh grades there is a solid course for American history. Tenth grade seems to be world history elements and twelfth also is filled with many electives. Each one of these tends to be a discipline field. An exception to this might be the problems of democracy or social problems course which is an elective at the twelfth grade. It may either be a sort of an experimental area or it may be a rather "cut-and-dried" course. So what is it that we are seeking? Are we seeking to develop a new course, units to fit within a course, or are we seeking to develop an entirely new approach to the social studies across the board? It might be all of these. Ninth grade seems at the moment a useful place to begin. Maybe we could use a new course on the meaning of personal and social change. The current course in civics is weak and many people now doubt whether it is the right thing to have at that particular grade level for the youngsters. Twelfth grade, of course, could do this same thing with more sophistication and in considerably greater detail.

From all the various kinds of reports that we have collected it seems that change as a phenomenon is regarded as an important concept which needs to be taught. It might be possible to up-grade some of the materials from the current experimental elementary programs and present them at a higher and more sophisticated level. The ninth grade might offer a unit or two of this new type of material. Other units could then be prepared which could be fitted into other places in the high school social studies course as it now exists. Some of these would fit very nicely into a social problems course; others into a democracy course; or even into an American history course. This is one possible approach.

Some of the people, in the elementary program at least, feel that one possibility is that these materials can be prepared covering an average reading age of fourth, fifth, and sixth graders. Therefore, the material could be used at any one of these levels. We should be sure that our materials are based on concepts which can be introduced at a higher level as you move up the scale each time. You have to make sure that the basic concepts are presented clearly enough so that any students having contact with the subject for the first time (those who have moved into the community and so forth) would have no difficulty in recognizing the concepts and catching up with the rest of the class. Materials for teachers' use will be an essential, to help them feel confident. The elementary teachers are finding that the guide materials they have been given for use with this elementary experimental program are very useful. As a matter of fact they are so useful that they will make the people better teachers whether they continue to teach these particular units of material or not. Can we prepare material that will be flexible enough and adequate enough for any high school level? The consensus of opinion was that we could do this if we could come up with a basic set of concepts and then these could be approached in a variety of ways at various levels.

Many suggestions for classroom practice should be made. We are thinking now in terms of what kinds of suggestions are made in our materials for the teacher. There should be a wide range of activities or things to be done by the students, by the class, or by groups of students. Then the teachers could select from these and use those that have a direct application to this particular group of youngsters. We should not overlook the idea of a laboratory manual type of thing which was brought up by several of the people we have spoken to.

What can we do about values? What is a value and what values should we support, if any? How can we develop these when we tend to think primarily in terms of content and procedure? This is the problem that we have not worked with but we need to be thinking of. Perhaps we need to get into contact with the other groups of the Consortium who are dealing with values in the social sciences.

The teachers make a basic error if, because of their own particular training, they become so involved in content that they forget about procedure. Often they work with the assumption that they can proceed by lecturing or having students read, and that once a content has been presented in this fashion this is all that is necessary. What they really need to do is think of the material here in terms of what I would like to teach the youngster. What is the best possible way that this can be done? Lecture, reading, group work, individual experience, setting up experiments, working through the community, etc.; What is the best way? The teachers should build their lesson plans around this kind of thought. This is the kind of material we are going to have to provide in the units or courses which we design. We are going to have to cover a wide enough range of possibilities so that there will be something for everyone.

Another aspect of this problem is what is to be the role of the teacher. Is a teacher to remain as a full leader, or director, or assume the role of indirect leader, or a guider of learning? We can think of the class in terms of educational psychology, and think of the teacher as the decision-maker. The teacher has to make certain kinds of decisions about the group, about the material, and about his own position. Within this he decided day by day, unit by unit, or lesson by lesson what is the best approach. The problem will be to persuade teachers to try a method where they are not the focal point of the lesson. Traditionally the lesson is dominated by the teacher who is the sole authority present but, with our kind of material, this is probably going to have to change. This is another reason why we need a large quantity of materials for the teacher. Let us avoid, if we can, the traditional work book method. In the workbook in the experimental elementary social science materials, there is no hint of the old copying method. The children must take the concepts encountered in the reading and in the class activity and use them in some new fashion to answer the questions or problems in the workbook. This is an entirely different thing.

We need to look into the matter of whether we are to be thinking now of the segments of the disciplines or an interdisciplinary appraoch. We have had people consulting with us from economics, sociology, psychology, and other social science disciplines: now we have to decide whether we want units of work which fit into these separate disciplines or whether we are going to try to structure certain kinds of "experience units" which are interdisciplinary in their approach. Currently the separatists are winning, and all across the country a whole array of new courses is being added to school schedules. They are all esoteric courses tied to a discipline.

Opportunities for working on our plans may come when University High closes and the Ann Arbor ninth grade and the University High ninth grade have different curricula. Ninth grade civics at the University School tends to be exploratory and it might be that we could work out some units, substitute them in their ninth grade and use them with the understanding that we would probably try to adopt this in the future. The seventh grade is another place where we might think of possibilities of units to be introduced. Particularly this might be true if the elementary material is used rather widely; it may be that this will be a logical step. Ultimately we may have to end up with different kinds of material so that some of the schools which have covered this experimental material in the elementary grades will have a different set of material to use at the secondary level, while some of the schools which have not done so will need material which is not simpler but of more basic form perhaps.